

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

The conclusion of this work should not be so categorical nor so pragmatic. But it must be: "Second look endoscopy seems to offer no advantage in the prevention of ESD and PUD-associated rebleeding. The decision to perform a Second look endoscopy must be personalized and individualized, despite SLE decreasing the hospital length of stay on average by 3.5 days in PUD patients".

We thank the reviewer for the comment. We revised the conclusion to include the above statement.

(1) Please provide the filled conflict-of-interest disclosure form.

Done

(2) Please provide the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT. All text can be edited, including A, B, arrows, etc. With respect to the reference to the Figure, please verify if it is an original image created for the manuscript, if not, please provide the source of the picture and the proof that the Figure has been authorized by the previous publisher or copyright owner to allow it to be redistributed. All legends are incorrectly formatted and require a general title and explanation for each figure. Such as Figure 1 title. A: ; B: ; C: .

Done

(3) The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words.

Done

(4) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text (and directly before the References).

Done