



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 83729

**Title:** One in Four Patients with Gastrointestinal Bleeding Develops Shock or Hemodynamic Instability: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05352593

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Colombia

**Author's Country/Territory:** Hungary

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-13 15:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-22 14:56

**Review time:** 8 Days and 23 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for inviting me to read this study. This study describes the proportion of patients who developed hemodynamic instability and shock after gastrointestinal bleeding. The manuscript is well written; however, their findings showed a high heterogenetic so it would not allow us to their results to clinical practice. I have some comments: Abstract: • Please, the study aim was described following the PICO statement. • Please, include the I2 in your findings. Introduction: • As described above. The study aim was described following the PICO statement. Methods: • The authors could explicate because they applied the CoCoPoo framework instead PICO statement to establish the eligibility criteria. • The screening and selection were performed by two authors (M.O. and E.T.) and Data extraction by another author (M.O. and A.R). Usually, the authors who performed the screening also performed data extraction. The authors could explain to me this difference. • The authors must describe how Hemodynamic instability and Shock on admission were defined. • Was a sensitivity analysis performed based on the risk of bias assessment? Results: • Table S2 y S1 could be deleted. • Each study in table S5 must include a reference.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 83729

**Title:** One in Four Patients with Gastrointestinal Bleeding Develops Shock or Hemodynamic Instability: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 06131948

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Teacher

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Russia

**Author’s Country/Territory:** Hungary

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-04-28 13:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-06 12:23

**Review time:** 7 Days and 22 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This interesting study is devoted to estimating the prevalence of hemodynamic abnormalities in gastrointestinal bleeding according to meta-analysis. The authors did a lot of work to find and analyze data sources. Comments: 1. It is recommended that the aim of the study in the abstract be made a stand-alone sentence rather than an extension of BACKGROUND. In its current form, the aim is not very clear. The aim in the article itself and the abstract are different; it is recommended that it be corrected. 2. The materials and methods do not describe the criteria for hemodynamic instability and shock that were considered in the current analysis. It is necessary to detail these data. There is some discussion, but the criteria that were considered in the current study should be clearer. 3. Have any other relationships of hemodynamic instability been analyzed, e.g., age, disease, prognosis, etc.? It would be helpful to increase the understanding of the clinical relevance of the current study.