

## ANSWERING REVIEWERS

We have change the manuscript according to the suggestions of the three reviewers. All these changes were highlighted in the text with red color.

### **Reviewer 1:**

- we changed the % of men, so that females % + males % = 100%
- abstract: we improved the second paragraph from the results; in conclusions we responded to our main objective
- we changed in the text the statistical analysis (we replaced mean by median in the main text and Table1)
- we replaced ORs with OR and CIs with CI
- we removed to tables and simplified the remaining
- we included % in figure 1
- table 2 – we mentioned the usefulness of this endoscopic method in the legend
- we simplified table 3
- table 4 was changed – we introduced variables in the first column
- table 5 was removed
- tables regarding clinical and endoscopic features associated with death due to rebleeding/ death (former table 7 and 9, respectively) were simplified
- we shortened the discussions, focusing on our study
- we highlighted the clinical usefulness and perspectives of our research

### **Reviewer 2:**

- we focused the predictive model and its clinical importance
- 1. we removed two tables and made the other more easy to understand
- 2. only the endoscopic hemostasis was evaluated in our analysis
- 3. we modified conclusions accordingly
- 4. we deleted the 3rd and 10th row from table 2

**Reviewer 3:**

- we reduced the size of the manuscript by shortening the discussions, we renounced at two tables and simplified the rest of the tables
- regarding discussions, we summarized the finding of other similar studies in Table 10 and changed the discussions accordingly
- we have the language certificate for this manuscript