

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics*

**Manuscript NO:** 76974

**Title:** Impact of epinephrine volume on further bleeding due to high-risk peptic ulcer disease in the combination therapy era

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03474116

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** AGAF, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-04-13

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-05-26 12:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-05-29 07:42

**Review time:** 2 Days and 19 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<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

General: In this study, the authors investigated the impact of epinephrine volume in bleeding peptic ulcers patients treated with combination endoscopic therapy, such as endoscopic thermal therapy and/or clipping. Authors showed that there was no association between epinephrine volume and all primary and secondary outcomes in multivariable analyses. Major comments: 1. Technics of endoscope may be influenced factor for re-bleeding. Where to inject the drug is important. 2. Please add information of H. pylori infection in Table 1. 3. Rebleeding may depend on location of peptic ulcer, such as lower area of stomach. 4. How many cases are on dialysis? 5. Please add numbers in the table 2. 6. I general, antithrombotic drug is a risk factor for re-bleeding. Why did authors fail to show significant difference in this study? 7. What is the difference between 7 days and 30 days? 8. Is it necessary to change the measures depending on the difference? 9. The use of epinephrine as a first-line treatment may not be popular in the world. Recently, Clipping or coagulation may be selected as a first-line treatment. 10. Authors need to clarify the position of epinephrine treatment. 11. Injection of epinephrine at higher epinephrine may exacerbate ulcers. How about in this study?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics*

**Manuscript NO:** 76974

**Title:** Impact of epinephrine volume on further bleeding due to high-risk peptic ulcer disease in the combination therapy era

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03726153

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** Doctor

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-04-13

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-05-26 09:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-06-03 09:38

**Review time:** 7 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
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

<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**

• You have to precise in the section materials and methods, the definition of large volume of epinephrine • The number of patients who received large volumes (only 18) is very small to be able to draw conclusions. • Other important factors were not studied as: duodenal ulcer location and vitamin K overdose • In the section discussion: In the last line you mean table 4 not 3 ?? • In the conclusion: you cannot conclude about the effect of epinephrine volume on the prognosis in the case of monotherapy (it is not the aim of this study) • It would be better if you modify the title: Impact of epinephrine volume on peptic ulcer recurrent bleeding in the combination therapy era.