

## REPLY TO THE COMMENTS

*Comment 1:* This is an exhaustive meta-analysis comparing two hybrid antibiotic regimes with other regimes in the treatment of resistant strains of *Helicobacter pylori* and contains a lot of valuable information. Tables 1-4 are rather long and possibly more suitable for an academic thesis than for a gastroenterological journal. With slight changes to the text these Tables could be omitted, because their abstracted information is already available in the text.

**Reply to comment 1:** We thank the reviewer's valuable comments! We have made some changes to the text and deleted Tables 1-4 in the revised manuscript (P10, lines 14-16: *These eight studies were performed in Asia and Europe with clarithromycin, amoxicillin and metronidazole resistances ranging from 6.9% to 23.5%, 0% to 1.8% and 20.7% to 56.1%, respectively.*; P15, lines 6-8: *All three randomized trials comparing the efficacies of hybrid therapy and concomitant therapy showed that no differences in eradication rates, either by ITT or PP analyses, between 14-day hybrid therapy and 14-day concomitant therapy.*).

*Comment 2:* Figure 1 would be improved if it included details of the other regimes - Standard Triple Therapy, Concomitant Therapy and Sequential Therapy. This would make for easy referral.

**Reply to comment 2:** According to the reviewer's valuable comments, we have included details of standard triple therapy, concomitant therapy and sequential therapy in Figure 1 (P25).

*Comment 3:* There is some confusion in the text with referrals to both "Tables" and "Supplementary Tables", and also to both "Figures" and "Supplementary Figures". This needs clarification.

**Reply to comment 3:** According to the reviewer's valuable comments, we have put "Supplementary Tables" and "Supplementary Figures" into the main manuscript, and modified the sequences of all Tables and Figures (No supplementary tables or figures in the revised manuscript).

*Comment 4:* The References need to be given in Superscript. References 16 and 17 are the same and the Reference 16 on the penultimate page (number 17) should correctly read 36.

**Reply to comment 4:** (1) All the references are given in Superscript in the revised manuscript. (2) We have deleted Reference 17 and corrected the numbers of the references following reference 16 in the revised manuscript.

**Thanks for the reviewer's valuable and constructive comments!**