

Replying for reviewers

Reviewer 1

It is an interesting study. But 1/ We need multicentric study 2/this technique need experimented doctor if not we lose the diagnosis 3/independent from the endoscopic finding, the histology is fundamental.

1: We completely agree with this suggestion. Therefore, we added to write in DISCUSSION as below: To support these conclusions, a prospective multicenter trial will be warranted.

2: We agree with this suggestion, too. As a reviewer said, this problem is one of the limitations of this study. Therefore, we have written this in DISCUSSION.

3: As a reviewer said, histology is fundamental and essential though the endoscopic findings are comparable to histology in this study. Therefore, we add to write this to emphasize as follows:

“Indeed histological assessment is fundamental, but endoscopic atrophy grading can predict extensive histological atrophy and may serve as a practical assessment of precancerous conditions during endoscopy in routine clinical practice, especially for patients in western countries.”

Reviewer 2

This study is meaningful and it is a good descriptive study in which authors assess the agreements between endoscopic and histological atrophy by using weighted kappa value. The results provide sufficient data to draw conclusions and suggest that endoscopic atrophy grading can predict extensive histological atrophy and may serve as a practical assessment of precancerous conditions during endoscopy in routine clinical practice, especially for patients in western countries. The conclusions is well organized and describe findings based upon systematic theoretical analyses of the results. But, the study was based on historical cohort data and it is hoped that there is a prospective study to support the author's conclusions.

We completely agree with this suggestion same as Reviewer 1. Therefore, we added to write in DISCUSSION as below: To support these conclusions, a prospective multicenter trial will be warranted.