



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11026

**Title:** Concomitant therapy achieved the best eradication rate for Helicobacter pylori among various treatment strategies: A prospective, multi-center, randomized controlled trial

**Reviewer code:** 00183453

**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-30 14:08

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-30 15:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is quite well written. The authors report a prospective, multi-center, randomized controlled trial on Hp-infected patients. It would be useful to discuss PMID: 20695744.



**ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11026

**Title:** Concomitant therapy achieved the best eradication rate for Helicobacter pylori among various treatment strategies: A prospective, multi-center, randomized controlled trial

**Reviewer code:** 02535288

**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-30 14:08

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-12 18:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This work by Lee et al studies the concomitant therapy in the eradication of H. pylori infection and compared it with three other treatment regimens. The results find that concomitant therapy achieved the highest eradication rate at about 90%. These results are in line with current concept that has been reported in the literature. The data collection, analysis is performed correctly, but manuscript needs much grammatical improvements, and it is recommended that authors will revise the manuscript to make it a better shape. Minor points: 1. Throughout the text, grammatical errors, such as the use of article “the” are very common, especially in the abstract, introduction and discussion sections. 2. The manuscript has two “Table 1”, two “Table 3”, at this stage of submission, I could not figure out why errors like this can happen. 3. In Discussion section, the last sentences is very confusing, it is hard to understand what is the point that authors are trying to deliver, “therefore....therapy”, please clarify and make it easier to understand. 4. In Figure 1, the 2nd eradication parts, is there a better way to label the ITT and PP patients, since the numbers are not easily counted before performing extensive text reading.