

Dear Reviewers,

Great thanks for your professional review work on our article. As concerned by you, there are several limitations and problems that need to be revised. According to your nice suggestions, we have made corrections to our previous draft, the point-by-point response corrections are listed below.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript entitled "Helicobacter pylori infection in Xinjiang: Uyghur suffer more than Han & urea breath test was more sensitive than immunostaining" is good quality and well-designed manuscript. The limitation is that the discussion section needs to be expanded. Please standardize the writing of *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*).

Reply: Thank you again for your positive comments on the scientific quality of our manuscript, and for the valuable suggestions to improve it.

(1) We had sent our manuscript for language polishing to a professional English language editing company and provided a language certificate along with the revised manuscript.

(2) We had expanded the discussion section as suggested by you.

(3) We had standardized the writing of *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*).

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

- *H. pylori* should be specified with italic font through the text.
- Abstract should be contains maximums 500 words.
- Core tip was missing.
- Provide more details regarding sensitivity, specificity, Positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV), or ROC curve to be more informative.
- Discuss about novelty of the manuscript.

- Discuss about limitation of study

- Conclusion was missing, the author should provide objective conclusion with further perspectives.

Reply: We really appreciate for the thoughtful comments provided by you on our submitted article. The paper was revised according to your comments.

(1) *Helicobacter pylori* or *H. pylori* in abbreviation was specified with italic font through the text as suggested by you.

(2) We had made sure than the abstract contains maximums 500 words.

(3) We provide the Core tip which was missing in the initially submitted manuscript.

(4) Currently, there is no gold standard test for detecting *Helicobacter pylori* (HP). Many systematic reviews have shown that both invasive and non-invasive methods have their own advantages and disadvantages. IHC and 14C UBT was most widely used in our hospital as *H. pylori* routine screening method, and both methods have a specificity approaching 100%. The main purpose of our study is to describe and compare the *Helicobacter pylori* infection rate in Uyghur and Han Chinese populations using large sample data, and the secondary purpose is to compare the *Helicobacter pylori* positive detection between the two methods. As there is no gold standard method for HP testing, this study only compared and discussed the sensitivity as an indicator.

(5) We expanded the discussion about novelty of the manuscript and the limitation of study according to the reviewer's comment, please find the corrections in the in the Discussion section of the revised manuscript.

(6) We provide a conclusion as suggested by you, and we added further perspectives as suggested.

(7) We had sent our manuscript for language polishing to a recommended English language editing company and attached a language certificate.