



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_49477
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing diagnostic performance of Pronto dry rapid urease® and culture to histopathology among endoscopy patients at the Aga Khan University Hospital, Nairobi-Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Extensive reviewing of the english grammar is needed before possible publication by a native english speaker.</p> <p>Why authors have excluded patients with acute abdominal pain ? Were included only adult patients ?</p> <p>Describe random sampling (computer? Letter?) and inclusion ratio (1:2? 1:3 ? 1:X?)</p> <p>Please explain "overnight fast"</p> <p>Please described the maceration procedure (time? Nature of the buffer?...)</p> <p>What significance value been used for this study 5% or less?</p> <p>Please provide a table with demographic and clinical information about the included patients (age, place of living, place of birth, date of beginning of symptoms, severity of symptom, alimentation ...)</p> <p>Please provide some information about the discrepant results compared to histology. Are this samples well classified by the other tested method for example?</p> <p>Authors stated that the lack of performances could be due to antibiotic administration prior to sampling but it seems that antibiotics tacking is an exclusion criteria. Please explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive reviewing of the english grammar is needed before possible publication by a native english speaker: English grammar reviewed on the whole manuscript. • Why authors have excluded patients with acute abdominal pain ? Were included only adult patients ?: Correction has been made in the text; patients excluded were not those with acute abdominal pain (which is one of the dyspepsia symptoms)as originally stated but those with abdominal bleeding 7 days prior to the study. Only adult patients were included, studying minors was untenable due to absence of paediatric gastroenterologists and consenting issues. Age issue has been included in the limitations. • Describe random sampling (computer? Letter?) and inclusion ratio (1:2? 1:3 ? 1:X?): This has been described in the document. • Please explain "overnight fast": This has been described in the document. • Please described the maceration procedure (time? Nature of the buffer?...): This has been described in the document. • What significance value been used for this study 5% or less?: This study was not powered to test for significance. However chi-square test of significance was used to compare Pronto dry rapid urease® and culture with the reference histology as in Table 2. Performance measures were also compared at 95% Confidence interval. • Please provide a table with demographic and clinical information about the included patients (age, place of living, place of birth, date of beginning of symptoms, severity of symptom, alimentation ...): Place of living, place of birth, date of beginning of symptoms, severity of symptom, alimentation was not collected. Of the demographics, only age and sex have been provided since they were collected during the study. • Please provide some information about the discrepant results compared to histology. Are this samples well classified by the other tested method for example?: This has been noted as a limitation. • Authors stated that the lack of performances could be due to antibiotic administration prior to sampling but it seems that antibiotics tacking is an exclusion criteria. Please explain: This has been explained and highlighted in the discussion
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Prefer not to use "it's"</p> <p>Please consider biologist more than just pathologists</p> <p>Change "pregant mother"</p> <p>"A study conducted by" + an author and not + a reference</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's changed to it is • Please consider biologist more than just pathologists: In our local set up the said work is done specifically by a pathologist. • Change "pregant mother": Changed •



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	