

Reply to reviewers

Reply to reviewer 1:

Many thanks for your review. With regards to the introduction, the hypothesis is in the 3rd paragraph. Null hypothesis would be that there would be no difference in clinical outcomes with different volumes of adrenaline used, different number of hemoclips placed and whether >2 or <2 endoscopic modalities are used. With regards to our cohort of patients, we included all patients presenting with NVUGIB admitted between 2014 and 2015. Their characteristics are highlighted in table 1. The 1st paragraph in the discussion repeating the main background characteristics of our patient cohort have been removed to avoid repetition. Detailed comparison with other studies was undertaken in the subsequent paragraphs. Limitations section expanded. With regards to the conclusion, I feel that it is important to reiterate the main results of the study. The last statement reflects the take home message. In addition, an article highlights section will be provided as required by the journal highlighting the important aspects of this study.

Reply to reviewer 2:

Many thanks for your review. Your points are duly taken. The message regarding the volume of adrenaline and number of hemoclips have been added in the discussion section and elaborated upon.