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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The manuscript Helicobacter pylori recurrence after eradication in Latin America: Implications for gastric cancer prevention by Juan E. Corrala, et al, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida, analyses clinical relevant question. High H pylori reinfection rate can jeopardize eradication efforts as well as gastric cancer prevention strategies in Latin America. The manuscript is well written and of sufficient critical distance to data collected. It deserves to be published in World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology.
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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The paper is written clearly in general. The following comments need to be addressed.

1. H. pylori infection recurrence may result from re-growth or re-infection. Please check the manuscript and the tables to ensure that these words are accurately used.
2. Table 2. Please add footnote to indicate how crude recurrence rate was calculated.
3. Page 9, first paragraph: Was the first year recurrence rate calculated from all studies in Table 2? If so, how about the recurrence rates at 4,5,6,7, 12, 16 years? Only two studies had more than 5-year following-up, which means that most of these data were from one or two studies. The authors need to comment on this in the discuss part.
4. Please italicize the names of bacterial species.
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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This manuscript is well written and clinically interesting. Results are presented clearly and conclusions are supported by results. I do not have any comment.