

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

**Manuscript NO:** 82359

**Title:** Relationships of Hospitalization Outcomes and Timing to Endoscopy in Non-Variceal Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding: A Nationwide Analysis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04970307

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MMed

**Professional title:** Associate Chief Physician, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-19 10:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-22 03:04

**Review time:** 2 Days and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="radio"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="radio"/> Minor revision <input type="radio"/> Major revision <input type="radio"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Based on a nationwide analysis, the authors concluded that early EGD in NVUGIB is associated with lower mortality and decreased healthcare usage, irrespective of AC status. Although numerous studies have investigated the optimal time of EGD in patients with upper gastrointestinal bleeding and consensus that early EGD is associated with better outcomes have been achieved, this study is still has the strength of large sample, providing solid evidence. The design, analysis and writing of this manuscript are well, only one comment will be listed below: The definition of hospital volume in this study is complex and strange, it varied according to regions and beds. Actually, the outcomes of patients with almost very disease were better in experienced and high-volume hospitals, resulting from various reasons, one of which are the number of patients the clinicians experienced. The number of patients will not be decreased for clinicians to obtain the same experience when they work in hospitals with less volumes or located in rural. It is better to category hospitals based on the number of patients admitted for NVUGIB per year.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

**Manuscript NO:** 82359

**Title:** Relationships of Hospitalization Outcomes and Timing to Endoscopy in Non-Variceal Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding: A Nationwide Analysis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06198465

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-29 09:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-02-02 13:47

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

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

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

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a fascinating study on non-variceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding. Regarding the need for emergency nighttime endoscopy, it would be interesting if the results of night and day endoscopies could be compared in each group.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

**Manuscript NO:** 82359

**Title:** Relationships of Hospitalization Outcomes and Timing to Endoscopy in Non-Variceal Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding: A Nationwide Analysis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02936184

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MBChB, MD, MRCP, MSc

**Professional title:** Consultant Physician-Scientist, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-29 21:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-02-07 00:29

**Review time:** 8 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

Dear Authors Thank you for your great effort and time to collect all these data and analyze the results. I have some comments: - Regarding classification of patients in relation to timing of endoscopy, the calcification used in this study is unusual and there is no referrals supporting this classification. - Usually patients are divided into: a) Emergency endoscopy in less than 6 hours b) Urgent endoscopy 6-12 hours c) Early endoscopy more than 12 hours but less than 24 hours d) Elective/late endoscopy after 24 hours - It is really on clear why the patient will remain admitted because of upper GI bleeding for 48 or even 72 hours without endoscopy and why a patient will need endoscopy done after 48-72 hours???? - In table 1: What is the importance of dividing patients according to the payment method/insurance type? - During assessment of hospital stay: Do days spent in the hospital before performing the gastroscopy are counted? Or the hospital stay is calculated from the time of having endoscopy done? - The classification according to hospital bit size has been accepted planed in a very long way and too many unnecessarily details. It would be better if the hospital bits ice classification was just divided into: Small-sized hospital less than 50 beds,

medium-sized hospital from 50 to 100 and large sized hospital more than 100 beds. Hospitals can be divided into teaching versus non teaching and Urban versus rural. - Although the number of patients in rolled in such study was very huge, important analysis has not been performed; comparison between the endoscopic findings of patients wonder went endoscopy in the 1st 24 hours with dose who underwent endoscopy after 24 hours after receiving medical treatment in the form of intravenous PPI. Do the endoscopic findings differ between both groups?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

**Manuscript NO:** 82359

**Title:** Relationships of Hospitalization Outcomes and Timing to Endoscopy in Non-Variceal Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding: A Nationwide Analysis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02535147

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor, Lecturer

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-29 12:26

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-02-07 11:37

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

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<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
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

Weissman S, et al. have identified that early EGD (< 24 hours) is important to reduce mortality, ICU admission, hospital length of stay, and hospital charges using the National Inpatient Sample database. Other factors such as male sex, Hispanic or Asian race, CCI=4 could predict poor outcomes in patients with NVUGIB. It is a unique and interesting study; however, there are several serious problems in the study and the authors should address the comments below. Major points: 1) The authors should clearly show the result of subgroup analysis to identify the anticoagulation use in Table that was mentioned in Page 7, Lines 3–4. The authors should also show the result of sensitivity analysis in Table that was mentioned in Page 7, Lines 6–7. 2) The authors should include information of H. pylori infection status, medications (e.g., antiplatelets and anticoagulants), and hemostasis (e.g., endoscopic hemostasis, IVR, and surgery) in Table 1. Moreover, comorbidities should be described in more detail in Table 1. 3) Although the authors described that “other factors such as–Male sex, Hispanic or Asian race, Medicaid insurance, age > 50, and those with more numerous comorbidities, all of which may help predict patients at high risk for adverse hospital outcomes in NVUGIB”,

the results of Medicaid insurance and age > 50 were not found in Table 2. The authors should show the data in Table 2. Moreover, the authors should state in the footnote by which factors aOR was adjusted in Table 2. Minor points: 1) It would be ideal to add information about the location of bleeding peptic ulcer in Figure 2. 2) The relationship between left and right pie charts is unclear in Figure 1. Moreover, the caption is too small and hard to be read in Figure 1. 3) The description of lowercase and uppercase ("a" and "A", "b" and "B") should be unified in Figure 3-6.