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Reviewer's report:

I have raised several suggestions in my previous comments but some of them were not addressed or mentioned in your newly revised manuscript. Once again, my suggestions for your revision is the following, similar to my previous comments. To make your work more satisfying, these suggestions should be addressed or mentioned in the limitation paragraph if the data are not complete.

1. Many literatures have proved that the previous treatment experience would affect the eradication rate, probably related to secondary antibiotics resistance from previous treatment. Therefore, I suggest that in your table 1, baseline factors should include the treatment experience such as Tx-naïve or Tx-experienced. Also, this factor should be added into uni and multi variate analysis.

2. In your table 3, multi-variates analysis should be expressed in your table with p value. It's more important than uni-variate analysis.

3. Levofloxacin has been recommended and reserved as the 2nd line therapy by many guidelines. Could you please share your thoughts on the 2nd line therapy if the patients fail with this CLEB regimen. Your point of view will affect feasibility of CLEB regimen is real-world practice.

4. You mentioned in your discussion part, that the roughly eradication rates of clarithromycin, levofloxacin and metronidazole was 50-60%. The reference should be listed. Reference is very important.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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