Trinity College Dublin
Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath
The University of Dublin

Rm 1.42 Department of Clinical Medicine

Trinity Centre

Tallaght Hospital

Dublin 24

Ireland

September 26th 2016

Manuscript number: 29084

Dear Yuan Qi,

Many thanks for the opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled:

"Molecular detection of *Helicobacter pylori* antibiotic resistance in stool versus biopsy samples"

Please find below our response to the reviewer's and editorial comments.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if any further information is required.

Yours sincerely,

Sinead Smith PhD

Reviewer number: 2444976

"The authors describe an examination of antibiotic resistance in both gastric biopsy and stool samples obtained from patients who underwent testing for a urea breath test or had a gastroscopy performed. The main conclusion is that the Genotype Helico DR assay is not appropriate for use on stool samples. This seriously limits its use and thus the paper is of importance and deserves to be published. It would have been useful to include formal sensitivity testing to the bacteria isolated on gastric biopsy. The assay is not valid in stool samples and the reasons given for this in the discussion are sound. The fact that patients

who have HP diagnosed by UBT are different from those who have the diagnosis made on endoscopy is not surprising. In summary, the paper is well written , the main conclusion is important and I suggest to accept as is."

Response:

We are happy that the reviewer thought that "the paper is of importance and deserves to be published". As the reviewer has suggested to "accept as is", we have not highlighted any changes in the revised manuscript in relation to reviewer number 2444976 comments.

Reviewer number: 3009715

I would like to thank the authors for their great effort, actually, the work on *H.pylori* is not easy at all. The manuscript is very well written, good discussion and references are up-to-dated.

Response:

As the reviewer has not suggested any revision, we have not made any changes to the revised manuscript file. We have not highlighted any changes in the revised manuscript in relation to reviewer number 3009715 comments.

Response to Editor's comments:

Changes are highlighted in red.

Q1

- The manuscript type has been changed to "Original Article"
- **"**Correspondence to" is included
- The Scientific Research Process file has been signed by the corresponding author and changed to PDF format

Q2

- The "Supported by" statement has been deleted

Q3

- The "Supported by" statement has been deleted

Q4

- The “Data sharing statement” has been deleted

Q5

- This study did not involve a clinical trial, therefore no “Clinical Trial Registration Statement” has been included

Q6

- The comments section has been included

Q7

- Figure 1 has been provided in PPT format