

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 49988

**Title:** Predictors of rebleeding and in-hospital mortality in patients with nonvariceal upper digestive bleeding

**Reviewer's code:** 02520359

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-06-27 18:55

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-07-05 11:25

**Review time:** 7 Days and 16 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with interest this paper regarding the investigation predictors of rebleeding and in-hospital mortality in patients with nonvariceal upper digestive bleeding (NVUGB) by Lazar DC et al . This study is a retrospective study, but has enrolled large number of patients



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

with detailed clinical and laboratory history. This manuscript has to be reduced in size and the tables (containing the predictors) are very big and difficult to follow. Regarding the discussion the authors would better summarize the findings of other similar studies in a table for better comparison and change the discussion accordingly. Some English language polishing is needed.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 49988

**Title:** Predictors of rebleeding and in-hospital mortality in patients with nonvariceal upper digestive bleeding

**Reviewer's code:** 00050424

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-06-29 16:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-07-06 21:10

**Review time:** 7 Days and 4 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study the authors analysed risk factors for rebleeding and mortality in patients with non variceal acute upper gastrointestinal bleeding. Although the number of patients in the final analysis is high and the authors examined a large number of factors the retrospective



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

nature of the study and the inclusion of only one center are limitations as the authors discuss. The authors should focus mainly on the predictive model they found and not on data from univariate and multivariate analysis. 1. There are too many tables. The authors must remove or merge some. 2. Were stigmata of bleeding evaluated in the analysis on only endoscopic hemostasis ; 3. In conclusion the authors state that consumption of aspirin and NSAIDs were associated with in hospital mortality but this only in univariate analysis not in multivariate analysis 4. In table 2 the 3rd and 10th row should be deleted ... none.....

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 49988

**Title:** Predictors of rebleeding and in-hospital mortality in patients with nonvariceal upper digestive bleeding

**Reviewer's code:** 00722601

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-06-25 09:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-07-09 16:27

**Review time:** 14 Days and 7 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract: - Background: "NVUDB can represent a severe..." -Results: not 100% (33% females , 66% men). Improve the gramathic of the second paragraph. -Conclusions: respond to your main objective. Methods: page 4: rebleeding not "releeding" Statistical analysis:



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

you say data are presented as medians and IQR but in the text they are presented as mean and SD. OR better than ORs and CI better than CIs There are a lot of tables. Reduce and simplify. Figure 1: include % Table 2: banding in 7 patients (clarify) Table 3 is too long Table 4 is confuse Table 5: what's the model? Legend. Table 7 and 9 too long. Data have to be presented more clear and remark the contributions of your study.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No