



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_28658
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of two standardizations used in antibiotic susceptibility testing in <i>Helicobacter pylori</i>
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This study involved aspects of Microbiology. The manuscript is well written, interesting and important for microbiologists, researchers and Hospital managers, although there are some suggestions to be done. 1. I suggest the reduction in size of the abstract, mainly the topics "Aims" and "Results". 2. In methodology topic, I suggest insert, after the name of the Hospital, state or country of study. It's not placed there, only in the abstract. 3. The topic "Materials and Methods" should get more items (eg. "Ethical consideration").	1. The "Aims" and "Results" (in "Abstract") were reduced (lines 25 to 27). 2. The name of the Hospital and the country of study were inserted (in "Material and Methods" - line 62). 3. In this study the authors used only random cultures of <i>H. pylori</i> stored in the laboratory (see "Materials and Methods"). Thus, it is unnecessary to include "ethical considerations".
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Nothing to disclose	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		