We are grateful to the reviewer for the very thoughtful critique of our manuscript which has helped improving our work. We are pleased to say that we have addressed all the concerns raised. Point-by-point responses to reviewer comments are given below:

Reviewer:
In this manuscript the authors evaluate in silico the H pylori TNF-A 5’-region [-584_+107] of Sudanese gastric patients. A total of 122 patients were screened for H Pylori infection. Out of them 61 H Pylori positive were further analysis using sanger sequencing and bioinformatic analysis. The authors also performed in silico prediction of promoter sequences followed by prediction of promoter associated features, prediction of CpG islands, prediction of transcriptional factors and regulatory elements as well we comparative profiling analysis. Five software in order to predict transcription factor binding sites (TFBSs). The study sample size and gender distribution seems reasonable. Among the seven SNPs that were observed in the TNF-A 5’-region, only one of them (T>A, -76) was located at in silico-predicted promoter region [-146_+10]. This particular SNP was predicted to alter transcription factor binding sites. There was lack of association with the -1030 (T/C; rs1799964) SNP (commonly found in Africans) For a descriptive analysis the studies seem to be optimal The paper switches between 7 SNPs and 8 SNPs in the write up. The authors should carefully check the text for uniformity.

Authors’ response: We have checked the text for uniformity and every 8 was replaced accordingly to 7 SNPs which is the actual number of the detected SNPs in this study.

Limitations of the study have not been clearly presented and should be discussed in a paragraph Validation in larger cohort is needed to validate these findings

Authors’ response: Limitations of the study have been clearly presented in a separate paragraph and recommendation for further larger cohort studies to validate the findings of this study has also been presented.
Minor typos were observed throughout the manuscript that should be carefully checked and corrected.

Authors’ response: Minor typos have been carefully checked and corrected, and changes were made accordingly.