

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

Compulsory 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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the challenge of declining efficacy in traditional H. pylori eradication therapies and compares the effectiveness of alternative treatment regimens. Understanding the comparative efficacy of triple therapy versus quadruple concomitant therapy can guide clinical decisions, particularly in regions with high antibiotic resistance. The study's relevance is heightened by its focus on a specific population in Tunisia, where local resistance patterns may influence treatment outcomes. I appreciate the rigorous design of the study and its potential to impact treatment guidelines.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, for greater specificity, it could be refined to: "Comparative Efficacy and Safety of 14-Day Triple Therapy versus Quadruple Concomitant Therapy for Helicobacter pylori Eradication in Tunisian Adults: A Randomized Controlled Trial."	
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 is comprehensive but could benefit from minor adjustments for clarity. Suggestion: "Clearly mention the primary outcome measure (H. pylori eradication confirmed by breath test) and secondary outcome measures (adverse events and treatment compliance)."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. They follow a logical flow from background and aims, through methods and results, to discussion and conclusion.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of a double-blind, randomized controlled trial design strengthens the validity of the findings. The statistical methods are appropriately applied, and the results are presented clearly. The consideration of local antibiotic resistance rates adds depth to the discussion and contextualizes the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are sufficient and recent. They cover a range of relevant studies, guidelines, and resistance data. However, including more recent studies on H. pylori resistance trends and treatment efficacy from regions with similar resistance profiles could enhance the discussion.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but some minor grammatical corrections and improvements in sentence structure would enhance readability. For example, revising awkward phrases and ensuring consistency in terminology (e.g., "Hp" should be uniformly used as "H. pylori").	
Optional/General comments	Discuss potential limitations in greater detail, such as the single-center nature of the study and the lack of antibiotic sensitivity testing, to provide a balanced view of the study's strengths and weaknesses. Overall, this manuscript offers valuable insights into the treatment of H. pylori infection and contributes to the ongoing effort to optimize eradication strategies in the face of rising antibiotic resistance.	

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:	Saeid Amiri Zadeh Fard
Department, University & Country	Shairaz University of Medical Sciences, Iran