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Reviewer's report:

General
In general the study is acceptable but some revisions are necessary.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1) Introduction: I do not regard suturing of the omentum to the nasogastric tube as an adequate operation method. This detail must be omitted (the same in discussion).
2) Patients and Methods: Are the perforations really measured during operations? This detail must be reconsidered. More exact analysis of risk factors should be added. The statistical analysis must be specified.
3) Results: In text: The postoperative morbidity and mortality (causes of death) must be more carefully presented. Maybe a table could be more informative. Risk factor analysis must be added.
4) Discussion: One paragraph concerning factors that predict morbidity and mortality in patients with perforated peptic ulcers must be added. You have 17.5% mortality in patients with giant perforations. Relaparotomy must be considered in patients with continuous peritonitis. You cannot only wait and see.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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

Statistical review: No
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