



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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The methodology should describe the origin of the isolates - the type of patients, gastric biopsies from treated or untreated patients. However the most important thing is to mention that all isolates are true strains of H. pylori identified by molecular techniques; because microorganisms can coexist in the stomach as part of a microbiota and can to be distinguishable by molecular methods only. 2. The line 54 mentions: "Then, plates were incubated again under the same conditions, but for how long more?"	1. The authors disagree about the inclusion of the origin of H. pylori isolates because the aim of the study was to compare the performance of two standardizations. Therefore, epidemiological data is not relevant (type of patient, gastric biopsies from patients treated or untreated). We agree about the importance to indicate that the isolates truly were H. pylori. Therefore, we have included this information on the 61st line. 2. Incubation time was included on the 69th line.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The title should contain the techniques were compared	We believe that the title would be too long with inclusion of compared techniques.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		