

Response to Reviewers

Thank you for your valuable comments. We are grateful for your time in reviewing our manuscript and are pleased by the positive comments we have received.

Reviewer #1

To be honest, I have no expertise in this topic as I am an oncologist. I would prefer to review papers that are related to my field GI CANCER. That said, this project is very unique as the authors did extensive review, data collection and analysis in an important topic GI diseases and found that there are many areas that can be improved to reduce the cost!

Response: Thank you for your positive comments. We appreciate that you recognized the uniqueness of our study and the extensive review, data collection and analyses that our team invested in producing this manuscript.

Reviewer #2

This manuscript by Somashekar G et al perform an analysis of the 2012 National Inpatient Sample to identify the 13 most common gastrointestinal (GI) diseases, and concluded that preventable and non-chronic GI disease contributed to a significant economic and health burden comparable to chronic GI conditions, providing a window of opportunity for improving healthcare delivery in reducing its burden. It is very interesting.

Response: Thank you for your positive comments. We are grateful that you found our paper to be very interesting.

Editorial Office Comments

(1) Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the hospital outcomes and early readmission for the most common gastrointestinal and liver diseases in the United States. The topic is within the scope of the WJGS. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade A; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The manuscript is very interesting. The project is very

unique as the authors did extensive review, data collection and analysis in an important topic GI diseases and found that there are many areas that can be improved to reduce the cost; and (3) Format: There is 1 table and 4 figures. A total of 35 references are cited, including 7 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade A. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate. **The authors need to provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. The Institutional Review Board Approval Form is not qualified. Written informed consent was waived.** No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The study was supported by 3 grants. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGS. 5 Issues raised: **(1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; (2) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (3) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; (4) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (5) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.** 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: Thank you for your comments. We have added the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. Regarding the Institutional Review Board Approval Form, we would like to note that the data for this study was obtained from querying the Nationwide Readmission Database (2013) and the Nationwide Inpatient Sample (2012) which are publicly available datasets. Institutional Review Board approval was not necessary for a population-based public data set based on The Ohio State University Data and Specimen Policy and Human Subjects Research

Policy. Per 45 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR 46.101), research using certain publicly available data sets does not involve “human subjects”. The data contained within these specific data sets are neither identifiable nor private and thus do not meet the federal definition of “human subject” as defined in 45 CFR 46.102. These research projects do not need to be reviewed and approved by the IRB.

- (1) We have added the author contribution section.
- (2) We would like to clarify that our study did not receive grant funding.
Therefore, we will not be uploading a grant application form.
- (3) We have provided the original figures in a compiled power point as instructed.
- (4) We have revised the reference list as per the posted guidelines and have used the auto-analyzer.
- (5) We have added the “Article Highlights” section.