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HRQoL and its influence factors in patients with chronic gastritis and peptic ulcer: a longitudinal questionnaire survey

The authors have made considerable revisions to the manuscript as suggested by the referees. However, some comments are not completely answered. I would therefore suggest that the authors incorporate some additional amendments.

1) The title suggests that HRQoL is assessed over time, but when looking at the objectives of the study (last paragraph of the introduction), this is not described as a goal. This should be added.

2) The authors state in their answers to the reviewer that patients with peptic ulcers and those with gastritis are combined for the regression analysis. In addition, they state in their answers that ‘if we can differentiate between the two diseases, we can further study why, and then take suitable measures to improve their QOL’. If it is important to identify factors with an impact on HRQoL, shouldn’t this be done for the two diseases separately? Especially since this is an explorative study and also because the results show that HRQoL is different for the two diseases.

3) The authors respond to point 28 that ‘it is common display for multiple linear regression in statistics with many advantages. It is difficult to give reference category for continuous and ordered variables, such as age, perceived income’. First, when looking at table 1, the variables ‘age’ and ‘perceived income’ are presented as categorical variables. It is therefore difficult to see that they are included as continuous variables in the regression analysis. Maybe it would be better to report these variables as continuous variables in table 1 as well, because now it looks contradictory. Moreover, variables that are ordered are also categorical variables; for this type of analyses, ordered variables should be included as categorical variables. Lastly, I understand that table 4 and 5 are based on the output of the analysis, but it would be worth interpreting results before presenting them in the table. By that I mean that reporting ‘male gender’ instead of ‘gender’ would be more informative. At that moment a reader would immediately see that females are the reference category and that males have a better HRQoL. This does not change the results in the table, it is just a matter of rewording the variables that are described.
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