

Reviewer's code: 00503857

The authors conducted a retrospective study regarding the usefulness of modified cyanoacrylate as a rescue method for failed hemostasis in NV-UGIB patients. The topic is interesting and the study showed some promising results, although the patient number is small. One minor suggestion is that the authors should provide a paragraph in Discussion section describing the limitations of this study.

Answer to reviewers:

We agree with the reviewer comments and included the following paragraph within "Conclusions" dealing with limitations of retrospective observational studies:

Finally we consider important to underline that our results are derived from a retrospective observational study: it is well known that retrospective studies have a limited validity compared to randomized clinical trials because the characteristics of the subjects included, the data collected and measured outcomes are defined after the end of the recruitment. Our data have been collected in order to obtain a good level of quality, but, in retrospective studies this cannot be guaranteed. Furthermore, observational studies tend both to overestimate the effects of treatment and to have greater variability in effect estimates because of residual confounding. Hence our results should be read taking into account these possible bias