Reviewer’s report

Title: Classification of pediatric functional gastrointestinal disorders related to abdominal pain using Rome III vs. Rome IV criterions

Version: 1 Date: 25 Dec 2017

Reviewer: Malik Aydin

Reviewer's report:
This is an article outlining the comparison of the Rome criteria for irritable bowel syndrome, functional dyspepsia and "overlap syndrome". It is a retrospective analysis including 106 pediatric patients. Due to the daily use of Rome criteria in the clinics, the manuscript is clear and well-described, and the key messages catch the reader.

Some points/questions were as followed:

The introduction is a bit short, focusing firstly at the history of the Rome criteria and then listing step by step each criteria following by III and IV with more current literature could be interesting here.
In Methods H. pylori must be written in italic. Please, also reply why you choosed the age range of 8 to 17 and not a younger age, for example 5 to 17?
Results are good presented but I think the data has to be also figured out in graphs (2 graphs would be suitable at this point). Please include the absolute numbers in Table 1 and do the percentages behind in brackets.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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