

## **Response to reviewer**

Dear Editors and Reviewer.

First of all, we would like to thank you for your letter and comments on our manuscript titled “Epidemiology of perforating peptic ulcer: A population-based retrospective study over 40 years” (55190). The comments will help us to improve the quality of our paper.

Here is our response to the comments of the reviewer.

### **Reviewer #1 wrote:**

“1 Title. The title can reflect the main subject of the manuscript 2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflect the work described in the manuscript 3 Key words. The key words can reflect the focus of the manuscript 4 Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study 5 Methods. The manuscript describes methods in adequate detail 6 Results. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study, the result can guide clinical practice of peptic ulcer treatment 7 Discussion. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. 8 Illustrations and tables. The figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9 Biostatistics. The manuscript meets the requirements of biostatistics 10 Units. The manuscript meets the requirements of use of SI units 11 References. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections”

Our response:

Thank you very much for your careful review and affirmation of our research. As a response to your comments, we have not made any major changes to our article.

Other changes:

In order to meet the publication criteria, we wrote the “Article highlight” section as suggested by the Science Editor.

We have only made some minor changes to our manuscript, in accordance with “the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision” and “the Format for Manuscript

Revision” for our specific manuscript type: ‘Retrospective Cohort Study’. All changes have been marked in red in the revised paper. We hope that the revised version meets with your approval and can be accepted for publication in World Journal of Gastroenterology.

Yours sincerely,

Corresponding author: Aydin Dadfar, MD

## **Response to editors after second revision**

Once again, we would like to thank you for your comments and careful review regarding our manuscript titled “Epidemiology of perforating peptic ulcer: A population-based retrospective study over 40 years” (55190).

We have now addressed all the issues that you raised concerning our revised manuscript, and we hope the manuscript now meets the publication criteria. As pointed out in the “list of issues” The Acknowledgements section should not include funding source. We are obliged by our funder to acknowledge them in this manner in all scientific work which uses data from the Nord-Trøndelag Hospital Trust. Therefore, we have not deleted this section. We hope that this is accepted. Otherwise, you have our permission to delete this section.

Yours sincerely,

Corresponding author: Aydin Dadfar, MD