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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors present their retrospective findings in a group of Korean patients who had perforated peptic ulcer located in upper GI tract. Their aim is to define clinical characteristics and risk factors in the study group. The manuscript is well written and detailed in parallel to aims. Statistical methods are proper and hypothetical inquiries are fulfilled. Minor revision request is as follows: "Positive alcohol consumption was defined as those who drink twice or more in a week" + alcohol consumption for the last 3 months: these criteria should be revised or detailed. The definition of "drink" should be addressed including local alcoholic beverages) by amount (i.e: g/day or g/week). This is important since alcohol consumption is NOT known as a risk factor for peptic ulcer disease (Yamada's textbook p.1042), authors' finding of "association of alcohol consumption with non-H. pylori, non-NSAID associated PPU compared with solely H. pylori positive PPU" might have been a novel finding in literature. Therefore if alcohol use can be detailed further, this novel finding itself will be a very important point in this study since ulcer perforation has become so rare in the recent era of PPIs.
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A retrospective study on the characteristics of 396 patients admitted for perforated ulcer (gastric or duodenal). The article presents many data, but most of the data has little interest because it is not possible to understand if the detected characteristics are peculiar of perforated ulcers or common to all the ulcers. It would have been very interesting to set a control group of not complicated ulcers. The only solid data are those related to the comparison of gastric and duodenal ulcers that do not show particular clinical differences. It is still a fact of clinical interest.
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**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors elucidated the epidemiological characteristics and associated risk factors of perforated peptic ulcer in Korea. The present study was well organized and well investigated. I have no claim in the present paper.