



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 Helicobacter pylori
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	1) CDS method is the most important for this manuscript. Therefore, the authors should explain the CDS method in detail. What is "CDS"? Is CDS any abbreviation? INTRODUCTION is suitable for it. 2) Readers can't understand the meaning on the lines about Aims in ABSTRACT.	1) The meaning of the "CDS" method has been inserted in the introduction (line 57). However, the detailed explanation of the CDS Method is presented in "Materials and Methods" (lines 84 to 96). 2) The text of the "Aims" in ABSTRACT has been restructured (lines 25 to 27).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) The line "Both aiming ~ Helicobacter pylori" isn't a good English as "Subject + Verb" is wrapped in obscurity. 2) Typing missed words are found, peptic_ on the 35th line and H.pylory on the 119th line.	1) The phrase was modified and is clearer (lines 25 to 27). 2) The typing errors were corrected (lines 47 and 138).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		