

Reviewer1.

#1. H.pylori should be written in this form (and not H. Pylori) At the end of introduction, the sentence: "We designed a new material with NANA, GMP, and calcium (CaG-NANA), and anti-H. pylori activities of CaG-NANA were investigated and in vitro and in vivo." should be "...both in vitro and in vivo".

RESPONSE: We corrected all miss form of H.pylori and spelling.

#2. Both in the section "Experimental Design in vivo" and in the section "Inhibitory effect of CaG-NANA on H. pylori in vivo" (RESULTS) there is detailed the division in 4 gropus, please delete the latter.

RESPONSE: We deleted the sentence about division explain.

#3. When the authors explain (section RESULTS) the changes in the level of serum IL, this should be detailed in the text.

RESPONSE: We inserted the value of cytokine level and explained in detail.

#4. In the section introduction the authors should highlight, in one or two sentences, the relevant role of adhesion for H.pylori survival (see, for example "Rosso et al. Update on colonization, survival and antibiotic resistance of H.pylori at the molecular level. Minerva Biotec 2015; 27:149-57" or "Caron et al Tight junction disruption: Helicobacter pylori and dysregulation of the gastric mucosal barrier. World J Gastroenterol. 2015;21:11411-27.").

RESPONSE: We inserted the highlight sentence in introduction part and cited Caron et al. as a references.

Reviewer2.

#1. A linguistic revision by a native English speaker is necessary.

RESPONSE: We did our best to correct and verify syntax error of the manuscript and attached the certificate of English polishing.

#2. The meaning of S-NANA and G-NANA is unclear.

RESPONSE: S-NANA is standard NANA and G-NANA is Glycomacropeptide linked NANA which we inserted these abbreviations at materials and methods part (page 5).

#3. How was the number of CFU evaluated?

RESPONSE: The colonies were counted by dot stamp analysis using image J (<https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/>) and calculated average (page 6).

#4. In figure 5, it was not explained which treatment was given to the PBS group and, moreover, the meaning of PBS was not fully explained.

RESPONSE: PBS was used as control which we explained at result part (page 9).

#5. A group of mice receiving both antibiotics and CaG-NANA would have been useful to investigate whether they have mutual additive effect.

RESPONSE: We agree fully to reviewer opinion. But we don't have any data about antibiotics and CaG-NANA at a time. We are going to prepare further study for both antibiotics and CaG-NANA at the same time.

#6. The main drawback of the present study is that the evaluation of histological damage is only qualitative. There is no estimation of inflammation, density of H. pylori colonization and gland atrophy by a conventional score.

RESPONSE: We inserted the value of cytokine levels, but there is no other estimation method about H.pylori colonization and gland atrophy. Thus, we were supervised our mucus pictures and notified it was suitable from pathologist.