

Peer review response

Peer reviewer 1:

The Authors present the results of a very large study on the NIS database to identify outcomes of non-variceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding in NAFLD hospitalizations in the US. The dataset was very-well analyzed and, also given the very high number of patients evaluated, the results have major relevance for clinical practice. Well done! A couple of minor comments: -

Q1) Can the Authors comment on the generalizability of the results (e.g., healthcare utilization costs, but not only) outside the US?

Ans) Thank you for your kind words. In terms of healthcare costs, since different countries have disparities when it comes to delivery of healthcare like public healthcare in some parts, insurance based in others or out of pocket in some, the monetary burden on the patient and system cannot be generalized. Similarly in terms of LOS, it depends on the turnaround time of investigations etc. in different countries. Outcomes and complications can be generalized. Again, thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript.

Q2) The use of English language is very clear and personally I like it (and I am a non-native English, therefore I'm feeling a bit awkward in saying this), but sometimes it is not in line with the current standards of scientific literature. can the Authors revise the paper in terms of style?

Answer: Thank you for your encouraging response and the time you took to analyze the literature. We have incorporated your concerns and reformatted the verbiage used in the manuscript to meet the current standards of scientific literature. We hope you enjoy this version of the manuscript.

Peer reviewer 2:

Q1) Good analysis on NVUGIB and NAFLD Please add more details on NVUGIB causes

Ans) Thank you for your time and input. All the causes for Non-Variceal GI bleed with the respective ICD codes are included in the supplementary file. We have incorporated your suggestions in the main text as well as follows-

“Other causes include but are not limited to gastritis, duodenitis, angiodysplasia, non-variceal esophageal hemorrhage secondary to mucosal tears, etc. All the causes included in the study are mentioned in the supplementary material, malignancy as a cause of NVUGIB was not included in the study.”

Editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Hepatology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, “Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...”.

Answer: We shall include the tables and figures in a separate file in a uniform presentation. We hope you like the updated manuscript. Thank you for your time in reviewing our manuscript and giving us an opportunity to portray our findings.