

Answering Reviewers

Thank you for your valuable feedback and suggestions regarding our manuscript, entitled “Clinical characteristics of acute non-varicose upper gastrointestinal bleeding and the effect of endoscopic hemostasis” (ID: 89933). Those comments are valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have made the corresponding corrections and response which are listed below point by point.

1. **Presentation of Clinical Characteristics in a Table:** In response to your first comment, we have added a comprehensive table that presents the clinical characteristics of all patients. This table includes general information, etiological factors, and disease outcomes for the enrolled/assessed patients, thereby providing a clearer and more detailed overview of our study population.
2. **Ethics Committee Approval:** Regarding the ethical approval of our study, we apologize for any lack of clarity in our initial submission. We have now included the necessary information about the approval from the human ethics committee, including the project approval number. We assure you that all retrospective studies involving human subjects in our research have received the requisite approvals.
3. **Extension of the Introduction:** We have revised the introduction to make it more specific and informative. Additional previous findings relevant to our study have been incorporated, offering a broader context and a clearer rationale for our research.
4. **Improvement of Discussion:** In light of your feedback, we have enhanced the discussion section of our paper. It now includes a more detailed analysis and interpretation of our findings, as well as a comparison with relevant literature to provide a deeper insight into our study's implications.
5. **Gender-Specific Analysis:** We appreciate your suggestion to conduct separate analyses for male and female participants, with a particular focus on analyzing risk factors in the male group. We recognize the significance of this approach in terms of enhancing the specificity and relevance of our findings. However, the current design

of our study and the limitations of our dataset do not permit us to carry out such distinct analyses. Nevertheless, we firmly believe that our present methodology continues to offer valuable insights. We acknowledge the potential advantages of your suggested approach and will certainly consider it for future research endeavors.

6. Division of Female Participants into Groups: We are grateful for your advice regarding the division of female participants into pre- and post-menopausal groups for separate comparisons. This is indeed an important aspect to address in studies like ours. However, due to constraints in our data collection process, it is not currently feasible to implement such stratification in our study. We aspire to investigate this aspect in future research endeavors.

7. The age group stratification by Gender: We acknowledge your recommendation to stratify the age group by gender for analysis. While we recognize that this approach could potentially offer more detailed insights, the scope of our study and the limitations of our data prevent us from implementing this suggestion at this time.

We believe these revisions address your concerns and enhance the quality and clarity of our research. We appreciate your thorough review and helpful comments, and we look forward to your further guidance.

Sincerely,

Xiao-juan Wang, Shuang Han, et al.