

A point by point response to the reviewers' comments

We had revised all the paper according to your advice. Answer a few questions of yours:

Reviewer #2:

First, authors should follow IMRAD (Introduction with aim/s, Methods, Results, Discussion) approach to prepare materials. There are inconsistencies in this article when cohort description (Methods) presented before Aims (objectives) of study.

1. absent information what references used authors: [70]: The number of patients with stress-induced gastric ulcers has increased

Answer: Thank for your good advice! We have added reference DOI:10.3748/wjg.v25.i23.2911

2. I guess more appreciative used neural signaling (sure single nerve is not responsible for it) [73] The NTS is a relay nucleus of the visceral primary afferent nerve.

Answer: Thank for your good advice! We had revised the neural signaling according to your advice.

3. It need correction since H₂S produced in animal & human: [97]: In contrast, H₂S is a novel gas transmitter discovered recently, produced [98] endogenously in the brain and human organ tissues.

Answer: Thank for your good advice! We had revised the sentence according to your advice. H₂S produced endogenously in the human and animal brain and organ tissues.

4. This statement needs reference: [139] while NK1 receptors are responsible for 140 neurally mediated digestive secretion.

Answer: Thank for your good advice! We have added reference doi:10.1155/2015/495704

5. {180} Immunohistochemical fluorescence double labeling – the present information did not reflect content.

Answer: Thank for your good advice! We had revised this part according to your advice.

6. the description of the selected dose for treatment was not explained scientifically

Answer: We chose the NaHS (0.1 μ L, 4 nmol) dose based on pre-experiments and previous articles and references DOI: 10.26402/jpp.2020.4.05

7. Absent description of how was analyzed images of fluorescence photography and immunofluorescence staining data? What approach was used for evidence-based research?

Answer: Sealed fluorescent slides were observed under the OLYMPUS BX43 biomicroscope. The NTS location was found against the brain atlas to observe the CBS and c-Fos positive neurons, photographed, and evaluated statistically. The expression of c-Fos and CBS in the NTS was counted (number/0.01 mm²) with Image pro-Plus 6.0 software.

8. It's not correct: [181] We chose the RWIS stress model to activate neuron [25]

Answer: Thank for your good advice! We had revised the sentence. We used the restraint water immersion stress model to investigate acute stress-induced gastric mucosal injury in rats. This acute compound stress model causes changes in gastric function in rats under stress through enhanced parasympathetic activity in the innervated stomach.

9. Authors use the statement [313] We compared gastric motility images but presented morphological data. Only the statistic significant results should be presented. You could present some data which must be compared and discussed in all possible ways.

Answer: Thank for your good advice! The gastric motility Curves in rats before and 5 min after injection were counted respectively. The total duration of

contraction waves (T.D.C.W) within 5 min, the total amplitude of contraction waves (T.A.C.W) within 5 min and the gastric motility index (the product of amplitude and duration) before and after the 5-minute microinjection were evaluated statistically. The inhibition rate of gastric motility was calculated as follows: Inhibition rate (%) = (pre-injection value - post-injection value) x 100% / pre-injection value. The height between the highest point of the contraction curve and the baseline is the amplitude of the contraction wave. The time duration between the starting point and the ending point of the contraction wave is the time duration of the contraction wave.

Reviewer Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...". Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author,

"Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision.

Answer: Thank for your good advice! We have changed the figure notes to a uniform format and organized the images into a single PowerPoint file as required, and we have cited the latest cutting-edge research reference. DOI: 10.1088/1741-2552/ac2ec6; DOI: 10.1016/j.ejphar.2023.175595; DOI: 10.3390/antiox12051095