

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10064

Title: Accuracy of Urea Breath Test in Helicobacter Pylori Infection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00058381

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-03-11 13:36

Date reviewed: 2014-03-12 18:58

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"/> Existed	<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)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHORS MAJOR COMMENT This manuscript presents a meta-analysis of 23 studies on the accuracy of urea breath test in Helicobacter pylori infection. Its main drawback is the heterogeneity of the included studies; this, however, is not the fault of the authors of the meta-analysis. **MINOR COMMENTS** Introduction, fourth paragraph: What is meant by “dose of radian”? Figure 1: Thirty articles were excluded in the last step, but the sum of the corresponding subgroups (2+2+3+7+14) is 28. Some linguistic/stylistic problems.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10064

Title: Accuracy of Urea Breath Test in Helicobacter Pylori Infection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00053562

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-03-11 13:36

Date reviewed: 2014-03-13 14:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors state that ubt can be preferred in many clinical settings. Is it true? Which one of them? A brief more focused comment on serology, histopathology and stool antigen tests with polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for detection of H. pylori? costs? Reliability? Add, please, some comment and personal points of view or experience.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10064

Title: Accuracy of Urea Breath Test in Helicobacter Pylori Infection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00055108

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-03-11 13:36

Date reviewed: 2014-03-16 20:36

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"/> Existed	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the authors, in general: This systematic review has been well performed; with a well expressed objective (see comment 1), precise criteria for the studies included and the relevant studies which have been selected for further evaluation. The quality of each included study has been properly evaluated. It seems reasonable to perform a metanalysis and pool the results. The study strength/limitations have been elucidated and of course there is a problem regarding heterogeneity in the included studies. Comparing UBT to other tests for HP-infection – UBT almost always would come out positive compared to other tests – UBT is more or less the gold standard method. From a clinical point of view one could emphasis the UBT is not the test being used as the first test neither in diagnostic nor in post-treatment evaluation of a HP infected patient. There are several more available, easily performed and cheaper tests to choose. One should maybe also include that in the conclusion. A few specific comments: 1. Your objective is clearer in the abstract compared to the last paragraph in the introduction. Keep that and rephrase what's written in introduction. 2. Table 2 – maybe explain TP, FP, TN, FN in a legend/abbreviation list. 3. Page 6, Quality assessment: This tool is designed to assess the quality of primary diagnostic accuracy studies. It would be more appropriate to writeThis tool is designed to assess the quality of systematic review of diagnostic accuracy studies. 4. Does panel E in figure 3 give substantial more information than panel C and D. Suggestion to be deleted?