

Dear Editors,

I thank the three reviewers for their comments and suggestions. I have included below a point-to-point response for each reviewers comments.

Reviewer 1: There is indeed an absence of data on ASUC outcomes in the elderly population. This retrospective multicentre cohort study included ASUC admissions and then compared steroid non-response rates, response to medical rescue therapy and index admission colectomy. To my interest, the authors found that steroid non-response rates and short and long-term risk of colectomy in older adults were comparable to those younger patients. Thus I think this study will have important implications for the clinical management of ASUC in the elderly. I have no doubts about the author's intellectual base and the logic of the article, and I also did not notice any obvious methodological errors.

No additional revisions were required.

Reviewer 2: Dear Editor, I should first thank for inviting me as potential reviewer to read and comment on paper entitled "Older adults with acute severe ulcerative colitis have similar steroid non-response and colectomy rates as younger adults". In the current study, the authors aimed to assess steroid non-response rate during the index admission for acute severe ulcerative colitis in older adults. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study. Materials and method section is adequate. Ethics Committee approval was received. Tables are sufficient and well-organized. Short and long-term outcomes of acute severe ulcerative colitis in this older patients is not well described in the literature. I think that it will contribute to the literature because of that. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points clearly. Also, the manuscript appropriately cites the important and authoritative references but does

not cite the recent published articles. If the recent published articles are cited, the manuscript would be better.

The more recently published articles have now been included in the manuscript. (Reference 33 and 34).

Reviewer 3: Title of the manuscript needs changes, authors are presenting an outcome based on a retrospective data. The title does not reflect the same. Core tip needs modification. In core tip the gist with primary findings should be mentioned; whereas, authors mentioned 1st line of 2nd para of introduction as the first line of core tip, this is already referred by someone else. Manuscript should be revisited to check - use of article(s), verbs and punctuation marks. As it is a retrospective data so quality could not be assured; authors also mentioned it in their limitations. However, they believe that the data is extracted from a subspecialty hospital which follow proper guidelines thus, it is generalizable.

Title has been modified to reflect the retrospective nature of the study. Core tip has been modified to include the primary findings. The entire manuscript has been revised to check verbs, punctuation marks, and other grammatical errors.

Kind Regards,

Dr Deloshaan Subhaharan