

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2146
Title of the Manuscript:	Treatment of Helicobacter pylori infection 14-day concomitant quadruple therapy versus triple therapy: A parallel double-blind randomized controlled trial
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The subject of this research is very important because infection with H.pylori has become a serious problem in various countries of the world due to the difficulty of treating it, as triple therapy has become ineffective. Therefore, the effectiveness of currently approved quadruple therapy must be revealed. Comparison between triple and quadruple therapy in this study we need.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Comparison of the therapeutic effectiveness of triple versus quadruple therapy for <i>Helicobacterpylori</i>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract needs amendments that have been indicated and explained in the attached file (all the abstract needs to be rewritten in a different wording).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I explained the required modifications in the results chapter in the attached file. Briefly, recalculate the statistics because most of the probability values are wrong. You also did not provide sufficient explanation and clarification of the results. There are errors in the table titles	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References not sufficient	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Please follow the amendments and notes I indicated in the attached PDF file	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Meraim Attyah Kazaal
Department, University & Country	Al-Furat Al- Awsat Technical University, Iraq