

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17403

Title: CURRENT HELICOBACTER PYLORI TREATMENT IN 2014

Reviewer's code: 00036517

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-05 16:56

Date reviewed: 2015-03-19 11:32

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

Major points 1. This review is very well organized for H. pylori eradication. 2. I suggest that authors should add the review of eradication rates by the difference of PPIs in first line therapy part. Minor point I suggest that authors need to recheck this review for some spell mistakes. "H.pylori" should be changed to "H. pylori", and the name of bacteria need to be in italic. Also, there are many trouble of spaces, I suggest that authors need to re-check all sentences in this manuscript.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17403

Title: CURRENT HELICOBACTER PYLORI TREATMENT IN 2014

Reviewer's code: 01799104

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-05 16:56

Date reviewed: 2015-03-14 07:42

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript has been written in detail concerning about current *Helicobacter pylori* treatment regimens. My major critic is that many references you cited in the text are not related correspondingly. There are many discrepancies between your texts and references; such as page 3 reference 6, page 5 references 6 and 11, page 6 reference 6 and 7, page 7 reference 11, page 8 references 13 and 18. The reference 6 should be as follows: *Helicobacter* 2014; 19 (Suppl 1): 38-45.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17403

Title: CURRENT HELICOBACTER PYLORI TREATMENT IN 2014

Reviewer's code: 00068864

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-05 16:56

Date reviewed: 2015-03-20 21:29

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good work