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This is a very interesting clinical question and the methods are adequate to study it.

However, there are some minor issues I would like the authors to address.

1- The authors state that the serological panel is cheaper than EGDS. Please provide more information about it and include a cost-effectiveness analysis. From the data presented by the authors, for the serological panel to be cost-effective, the panel would need to cost about 1/3 of the EGDS. What would be the number of EGDS avoided for the panel to be cost-effective?

2 - The serological panel detects gastritis and HP infection. But what about other lesions like GIST or NET? In the sample, there were no patients with either pathology, but some reports state that GIST prevalence might be as high as 20%. Would the panel detect those lesions?

3 - Very few patients had severe gastritis in the sample. Would the results be different for patients with severe gastritis?

4 - Most importantly 10% (2/20) of the patients that would be recommended to avoid EGDS had erosive esophagitis. The authors discuss the selection of gastric sleeve vs gastric bypass, but if these (asymptomatic) patients were offered a gastric sleeve, chances are they would worsen their esophagitis. So... how much is too much? If we select the "wrong" surgery in 1/20 patients, does that worth the cost of not performing EGDS?

Overall the work is well done and concludes that larger cohorts with varying HP infection prevalences are required before recommendations to avoid EGDS might be made.
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