

Answering reviewers

Dear Editors:

First of all we would like to extend our most sincere gratitude to the editors for the thoughtful comments and helpful suggestions to our manuscript. Besides, we feel quite sorry for the seven-day delay and thank you for your understanding.

In line with the reviewers' comments, we extensively revised the manuscript. We described the changes in "Response to Reviewers" as follows.

In addition, we have carefully revised the language and the new manuscript has been read by an English expert. We have also updated the manuscript according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision-Randomized Controlled Trial and submitted the other required documents.

We would be very grateful if you would consider our revised manuscript for publication in *WJG*.

Response to reviewers:

1. Comments to Authors: I think author need amend some information of outcome of ^{13}C -urea breath test in the same patient with 4 different postures, which can provide the more trustful results.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer's suggestion. As the reviewer suggested, the results would be more trustful if ^{13}C -urea breath tests were performed in one same patient with 4 different postures. We have also considered the feasibility of this method before the study. In our present study, it would take about half an hour when seven breath samples of each remnant stomach patient were collected under a certain posture (the sitting position, the supine position, the right lateral recumbent position, or the left lateral recumbent position). If the same patient underwent ^{13}C -urea breath tests with 4 different postures respectively, 28 breath samples were to be collected. In addition, drug washout period was needed between different postures. So it would take much longer, maybe several days, for each patient to finish the study. As the latter protocol would add to the burden of residual stomach patients, it was very difficult to gain patients' informed consent and carry out the study. So we chose the former method despite the fact that the latter one could obtain more trustful outcome. And we tried to keep the baseline condition of each group similar with each other in order to improve the reliability of the results.

2. We have submitted the related documents (No.1 to No.13) according to the editor's letter. The duplicate rechecking rate is no more than 10%. Besides, we have made corresponding modification in line with the headnotes in the manuscript (No.1 to No.6).

Yours sincerely,

Zhi-Jun Bao

Aug 3, 2015

Corresponding author: Zhi-Jun Bao

E-mail: xinyi8681@sina.com