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Reviewer’s report:

The authors prospectively analyzed the therapeutic effect of polaprezinc for small bowel injury seen in patients under the treatment of LDA, and identified its possible favorable effect for the patients under CE. Considering the high prevalence of LDA-induced small-bowel mucosal injuries, and the lack of established strategies for the prevention, clinical studies, like this trial, should be encouraged. However, the reviewer has several criticisms regarding this manuscript as described below.

Major compulsory revisions
1. Totally speaking, the manuscript should be checked by a native English speaker.
   (Methods section)
2. P6, lines 2-7. Patients who were taking NSAIDs other than LDA should be excluded.
3. P6, line 15. Small-bowel mucosal injuries seen in the subjects were not definitely proven to be the injuries caused by LDA, because such mucosal injuries can be identified in a minority of healthy subjects. The authors should revise the description.
4. P6, line 15-P7, line 1. How were the subjects randomized into two groups?
5. P9, line 16. Considering the small number of subjects, the difference in the indications for LDA therapy should also be analyzed by Fisher’s exact test.
   (Result section)
1. P11, lines 13-14. The reviewer could not identify the meaning of the sentence.
   (Discussion section)
1. The authors should describe the strength and limitation of the present study much more precisely.

Minor essential revisions
(Discussion section)
1. P13, lines 3-5. The adverb “characteristically” should be changed into “specifically”. However, it seems to the reviewer that such a finding should not be emphasized in this manuscript, because ulcers were found in only 3 out of 20 patients.

(Tables)
1. Table 2. The number of CE score category of moderate or severe change seems wrong.

Discretionary revisions
1. The determination of CE score seems unnecessary when considering the way of definition.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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