International Journal of Infection
Volume 8 · Issue 1 · e98954

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparison of Clarithromycin-based Triple Therapy and Furazolidone-based Quadruple Therapy in Eradicating *Helicobacter pylori* Infection

Alireza Bakhshipour, Narges Mohsenpour Mohammadi, Seyed Mehdi Hashemi, Mohammad Kazem Momeni

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
12 Feb 2020	4 Jan 2021	13 Jan 2021	10.5812/iji.98954

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Referee 3, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8
4 **Revision 3** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

3 comments · 16 Feb 2020 – 29 Feb 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 16 Feb 2020

This is an interesting article comparing two different regimens (amoxicillin + furazolidone + bismuth subcitrate + omeprazole) and (amoxicillin + clarithromycin + omeprazole) for the eradication of H. pylori infection in patients with dyspepsia. To make the article more suitable for publication, some suggestions are proposed:
In the introduction ("Fakheri and his colleagues showed that furazolidone-based quadruple therapy …"), please eliminate the 11th reference as it was mentioned by Fakheri and then correct the order of the references. In the results, adding another table to show the mean age and sex of the patients who responded and did not respond to treatment, along with the p value, would help readers better understand what was mentioned in the text. In the discussion, please clarify the limitations of your study and compare your study to other research.
There are some orthographic and typing errors which need to be corrected. The article needs major editing and revision because of the poor English writing.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 28 Feb 2020

This paper has the potential to be accepted, but some important points have to be clarified or fixed.
1- The sensitivity and specificity of C13-UBT for the detection of H. pylori infection are lower than those of biopsy-based tests. Why did you choose this method?
2- The paper needs improvement in English grammar.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 29 Feb 2020

Dear Dr.
This is an interesting article comparing two different regimens (amoxicillin + furazolidone + bismuth subcitrate + omeprazole) and (amoxicillin + clarithromycin + omeprazole) for the eradication of H. pylori infection in patients with dyspepsia. To make the article more suitable for publication, some suggestions are proposed:
In the introduction, "Fakheri and his colleagues showed that furazolidone-based quadruple therapy …" please eliminate the 11th reference as it was mentioned by Fakheri and then correct the order of the references. In the results, adding another table to show the mean age and sex of the patients who responded and did not respond to treatment, with the p-value, would be helpful for a better understanding of what was mentioned in the text. In the discussion, please clarify the limitations of your study and compare your study to other research.
There are some orthographic and typing errors that need to be corrected. The article needs major editing and revision because of the poor English writing.

This paper has the potential to be accepted, but some important points have to be clarified or fixed.
1-The sensitivity and specificity of C13-UBT for the detection of H. pylori infection are lower than those of biopsy-based tests. Why did you choose this method?
2- The paper needs improvement in English grammar.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear EIC:

We apply all reviewer´s requsted in our manuscript

Reviewer 1

All recommendations were done in text with highlight(red).

Reviewer 2

The sensitivity and specificity of C13-UBT for detection of H. pylori infection are less than biopsy based tests, but we choose this method because all patients with dyspepsia should not be evaluated by gastroscopy(from academic standpoint) and the best approach is H.pylori evaluation by UBT or stool Ag.

Best

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 27 Mar 2020 – 4 Apr 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 27 Mar 2020

The English in the present manuscript is not of publication quality and requires major improvement. The article needs a major revision due to poor English writing.

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 1 Apr 2020

Dear Editor
The paper is suitable for publication in the International Journal of Infection.
Best Regards

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 4 Apr 2020

The English in the present manuscript is not of publication quality and requires major improvement. The article needs a major revision due to poor English writing.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Greetings

In the last review, our article had problems only in terms of English grammar, which have also been corrected, and the last text sent included the corrections

3 Revision 2

4 comments · 14 Sep 2020 – 28 Sep 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 14 Sep 2020

English writing is poor. The article needs another revision.

Referee 3 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 27 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,

Your article must be updated in both the introduction and discussion sections by using very new references like references 3 &4 or even references published in 2020.
Your article also needs editing by an academic who is a native English speaker.
Your findings should be suggested to Iran's Ministry of Health for inclusion in the treatment protocol.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 28 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,
Your article must be updated in both the introduction and discussion sections by using very recent references like references 3 &4 or even references published in 2020.
Your article also needs editing by an academic who is a native English speaker.
Your finding should be suggested to Iran's Ministry of Health for inclusion in the treatment protocol.
The English writing is poor. The article needs another revision.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 28 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,
Your article must be updated in both the introduction and discussion sections by using very recent references such as ref 3 &4 or even references published in 2020.
Your article needs editing by an academic and a native English speaker, too.
Your finding should be presented to Iran's Ministry of Health for inclusion in the treatment protocol.
English writing is poor. The article needs another revision.

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Greetings

In the last review, our article had problems only in terms of English grammar, which have also been corrected, and the last text sent included the corrections

4 Revision 3

2 comments · 13 Jan 2021 – 13 Jan 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 13 Jan 2021

Dear Editor,
The paper is now suitable for publication in International Journal of Infection.
Best Regards,

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 13 Jan 2021

Dear DR.
The paper is now suitable for publication in International Journal of Infection.
Best Regards,