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Reviewer's report:

Comment to the Authors

The form of your manuscript is almost same as recently published literature suggesting the usefulness of the AIMS65 in predicting the mortality for patients with upper gastrointestinal bleeding. Although a certain amount of patients were included in this study, there is no originality and novelty.

1. The research topic of this manuscript has already been performed in several studies. Do authors have any new recommendation for daily practice according to these results?
2. The authors should describe the criteria for the transfusion and ICU admission.
3. The authors should describe the sentence in methods about excluding variceal bleeding.
4. In 5 death patients with uncontrolled bleeding, were they treated with the interventional radiology or operational therapy to control bleed?
5. Were the patients with Forrest IIa or IIb gastric ulcer treated with endoscopic intervention? Because endoscopic intervention was secondary outcomes, author should describe the definition for endoscopic intervention.
6. Rebleeding occurred in 65 patients. Are there any differences in endoscopic findings, medications, or treatment?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
I have no competing interests.
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