

Dear Prof. Jing Yu,

The Editor, World Journal of Gastroenterology

We appreciate your constructive comment on our manuscript. We revised our manuscript entitled “ A Novel CagA ELISA Exhibits Enhanced Sensitivity of *Helicobacter pylori* CagA Antibody (Manuscript NO; 29465) ” according to the reviewers’ comments. The revised points are marked in underline with blue colour. We hope this revision can meet the requirements of yours. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Yoshio Yamaoka

Department of Environmental and Preventive Medicine, Oita University Faculty of Medicine,

1-1 Idaigaoka, Hasama, Oita 879-5593, Japan

Phone: 81-97-586-5742; Fax: 81-97-586-5749

E-mail: yyamaoka@oita-u.ac.jp

The manuscript has been improved according to the comment of reviewers, and highlighted in the updated version of the manuscript (underlined).

Reviewer 01436921 comment:

1. Did the authors presumed that Genesis Diagnostics Ltd use a western strain or did they characterized the *cagA* polymorphism of the Genesis Diagnostics Ltd strain?

Response; We contacted with the Genesis Diagnostics Ltd, and got the CagA sequences of the strain the company used as personal communication. We have confirmed that the strain has Western-type *cagA* genotype.

Reviewer 00505471 comment:

1. All sections of paper are excessively long.

Response; Thank you very much for your useful comments. We shortened each section as much as we could according to the suggestion. For example, the contents of purification of recombinant CagA protein and establishment of novel East Asian-type CagA ELISA in the material and methods section was simplified and the detailed information had been moved to “supplementary material”. Results and Discussion section had also been shortened according to the suggestion.

2. Some section require rewriting since they are not clear, e.g. line 196-9.

Response; We re-checked the manuscript carefully, and tried to rewrite the sentences that were not clear.

3. In the results section there is a lot of material which refer to methodology, e.g. lines305-16. These should be repositioned accordingly.

Response; We understand the reviewer's suggestion. However, one of the main messages from this study was to construct the novel CagA ELISA by ourselves. Therefore, we kept this content in the result section.

4. There is a lot of discussion including in the results section. Results should refer only data generated by the study.

Response; As suggested, discussion including in the results section had been removed as much as we could.

5. Discussion section is too long and thus the important issues get lost in unnecessary detailed.

Response; The content about the relationship between epitope and MHC haplotype was deleted, and add some sentences were added to emphasize important message (page23, line 429-434).

6. The most important message is not sufficiently emphasized.

Response; We revised the manuscript according to the above comments by the reviewers. As a result, we believe we could emphasize and focus on the important messages that novel East Asian CagA ELISA should be used in East Asian countries for detecting higher sensitivity.

7. Overall there are problems in language which require to be addressed to make the manuscript more readable.

Response; The manuscript has been edited and corrected by professional English editing service; Honyaku Center Inc., <http://www.honyakucenter.jp/> and we could get “Certificate of English Proofreading”.