## Peer Review File

Article information: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/amj-22-37.

Comment 1: Please further indicate "our department" in the sentence "patients that were admitted to our department and had undergone H. pylori tests".

Reply 1: According to your comments, we have added the relevant descriptions in the **Methods** section. They are highlighted by yellow in the main text (lines 123-124, Page 8).

Comment 2: Please consider discuss in the Discussion regarding the replied issue-"Based on previous literature review, the H. pylori infection rate in military personnel serving for 3 years or more (63.2%) was significantly higher than those serving for less than 3 years (53.4%), and the difference was statistically significant between the two groups (P=0.028) (Jiang HL, Chen FW, Xia XL, Tian J, Han QF, Zhong Q, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for Helicobacter pylori infection in Chinese military personnel. WCJD 2013; 21:4084-91). Accordingly, we defined the military service duration in the present study".

Reply 2: According to your comments, we have added the relevant descriptions in the Discussion section. They are highlighted by yellow in the main text (lines 286-292, Page 17).

## Comment 3: Please revise the P value following the criteria below:

- -If the P<0.001, report "P<0.001".
- -If the P value is between 0.001 and 0.01 and less than 0.01, report the specific P value to 3 decimal places, e.g., "P=0.001" and "P=0.009".
- -If the P $\geq$  0.01, report the specific P-value to 2 decimal places, e.g. "P=0.01" "P=0.06" "P=0.10" "P=0.90".
- -If the P-value is greater than 0.99, report "P > 0.99".
- -Do not round P-values, do not report "not significant" simply because the data are greater than an arbitrary value, and do not report only vague bounds such as P<0.05, as described above, but report the exact P-value.

Reply 3: According to your comments, we have changed the "p-values" in the main text and the tables.