



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 18353

Title: Limitations of urease test in diagnosis of pediatric *Helicobacter pylori* infection

Reviewer’s code: 00646241

Reviewer’s country: Germany

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-04-21 09:24

Date reviewed: 2015-05-23 02:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the paper, Limitations of urease test in diagnosis of pediatric *Helicobacter pylori* infection “ the authors Seo et al. give a very interesting overview of experiences using this test in children, with the observation of lower sensitivity, in particular in small children, and discussion of possible reasons, obstacles and consequences. The paper is well written, the language is near perfect, the figures are nice, and the conclusions are convincing. Although the work basically is intended to be a review, the authors present some interesting results of their own research. Here, they should also report their methodology, including materials and methods. For example, the authors describe that they compared the time points at which the positive result occurred, dividing these into 0-1 hour, 1-6 hours, and 6-24 hours, leading to higher sensitivity especially in the younger age group. However, this type of long-term incubation of the assessment probe is not further explained, which should be done. Further, no error bars or calculations of significance are given. Besides, there are no figures or tables showing analyses of other authors. At least, results of other groups should be presented a bit more in detail in a review. Possible methodological obstacles both regarding urease and histological analyses should be given more in detail, and in the conclusion, a clear recommendation should be



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>

given: which number of biopsies should be done at which age group, in order to prove or clearly exclude helicobacter infection, and which incubation time should be standard. Minor Points: p. 5 Instead of ...years (n = 224)^[20].positive results... Better write ...years (n = 224)[20]. Positive results... p.7 the sentence In most patients, biopsy specimens were taken from the antrum because antral area for heaviest colonization for H. pylori may be the lesser curve at the angulus, in the prepyloric region[26]. appears a bit confuse and should be reorganised.