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Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: SUMMARY COMMENTS

Additional suggestions

1. Page 2 line 21 delete "visited" and change to "who were treated at"

2. Page 3 lines 4-7. I would make this statement a bit stronger to see the most important finding of your study. What about changing "it might be recommended" to "we would recommend using the AIMS75" and in tads the word "so" before the word easier I on line 4. You have good data why not emphasize it!

3. Page lines 9-19 I am confused about ref #14. Were there a lot of varicella bleeding patients at in that study? If so then say it, maybe by adding the phrase "but this study included many (or even add the % of patients with variceal bleeding) patients with variceal bleeding which confounds the use of this scoring system for non-variceal UGI (NVUGI) bleeding" then delete the first two sentences starting on line 14.

4. Page 4 line 45 change to "Patients with esophageal or gastric variceal bleeding were excluded".

5. Page 4 line 38 change "enrolled" to "reviewed" and line 51 change "collected in" to "recovered from"

6. Page 5 line 16 capitalize "Dieulafoy's" also line 19 add the word "and" after the word "angiodysplasia"

7. Might the AIM75 also provide a rational for delaying emergency endoscopic intervention until the next day of patients arrive in the evening or night time? Think about this in the discussion; it is always debated if UGI bleeders who are stable need emergency endoscopy when they arrive.
8. You still need a bit of editing by someone a bit more precise with English writing (for instance page 6 line 4 "patients" should be "patient" and there are many other places that could be written a bit more smoothly, please do not take this as criticism but rather as constructive advice; being from the US, I can only try to imagine how difficult it would be for me to try to write a paper in a non-native language. A more precise editing will make you look "better", it never hurts because some journals consider this inappropriate while others realize that these minor necessary edits of the grammar are to be expected but other journals do not.

9. Page 7 line 9 don't you mean that the p values were "DIVIDED by 4 because of 4 multiple simultaneous comparisons"?

10. Page 7 line 48 do you mean "melena" (black tarry stools or do you mean "hematochezia" (altered blood in stool)? These two terms are different.

11. Page 8 line 14-16. Add what the cause of such massive bleeding was. It is very unusual to die from nonvariceal massive bleeding!

12. Page 8 line 19 change to "All but one of the 17 patients who died"

13. Page 8 line 36-39 I would again suggest that you delete the phrase "but there was no statistically significant difference between the groups". You give a p value let the reader determine how important these differences are! Or if you want say "There was a trend (p=0.07) suggesting that the AIMS65 scoring system (0.84) was more accurate.

14. Page 10 lines 43-page 11 line 19. Were these all NVUGI bleeding? If so say it.

15. Page 11 line 38. Change "somewhat" to "much more difficult to apply by the busy clinician"

16 page 11 line 51. Again point out that ref 14 had variceal bleeders as well and maybe also include their percentage.

17 page 12 line 9 delete the phrase "both study design and". The study design has nothing to do with data retrieval from the medical records and is not a limitation

18. Page 12 line 21. Move the last sentence up to the previous line before the sentence starting with "Because" - and add the word "Another " before "limitation"

19. Page 12 line 38 change to "The AIMS65 scoring system, however, is much easier". And online 41 add "by the busy clinician" after the word "performed". You have good data, showing it is as good may be better and moreover it is MUCH easier to calculate for a busy clinician! So why not emphasize this!

20. Finally Page 21 figure 2 legend. Again I would suggest that you delete the phrase "but there was no... groups". Leave the p value there.

Good luck. I think with these changes you emphasize the worth of your study better and are fair to the statistics because when a p value is =0.07 and you show it but do not say definitively that the values are "different" you are being honest! You show it but do not say definitively that the values are "different" you are being honest!
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