

Reviewer's answers

In general, it is an innovative paper, since, despite the multiple case reports and case series, authors are the first to perform a randomized clinical trial. Title, abstract and keywords are appropriate regarding content and form. In addition, methods and results are presented in an appropriate manner, based on the CONSORT guidelines. Regarding figures, a better description of the legends would be appropriate. Finally, no issues arise regarding biostatistics and ethical approval. Here are some proposed revisions: Major revisions • Regarding intervention group, Coca Cola consumption is stated to last 7 days in the abstract and 5 days in the main text. Please specify • Legends of figures 2 and 3 are not easy to understand. Are both of them from the intervention group? • Why was a second endoscopy performed in intervention group? Couldn't you define dissolution rate by imaging, such as CT, in order to avoid a second intervention? • At which time point was evaluation for Gastric ulcer rate performed? During initial endoscopy? During follow up? This point should be further elucidated. Minor revisions • Line 25 (onGPBs): a gap is missing • Regarding intervention group, Coca Cola consumption is stated to last 7 days in the abstract and 5 days in the main text. Please specify • Line 25: abbreviation "GBs" is used without being introduced in the abstract • Line 29: "were" is not correct • Line 47-548: double use of the abbreviation instead of the full-term-should be corrected • Regarding inclusion/exclusion criteria, it would be advisable to declare the decision process for patients with history of upper GI surgery or known history of peptic ulcer disease • How was bezoar volume measured? With endoscopy or imaging? Please explain • Authors use multiple times the full text "gastric phetobezoar" instead of GBP, e.g. in legend of figure 3, even after introduction of abbreviation. Please adopt a consistency • In figure No 3, it is stated that " the gastric ulcer became shallower", obviously compared to Figure No2. However, it seems deeper. Please explain • In line 193, the name of Gaya et al would be preferable mentioned, since otherwise the reader assess that the authors refer to the present paper • Line 268: a gap is missing

Answers of comments are as follows:

Major revisions

- Regarding intervention group, Coca Cola consumption is stated to last 7 days in the abstract and 5 days in the main text. Please specify

It has been corrected in line 100.

- Legends of figures 2 and 3 are not easy to understand. Are both of them from the intervention group?

It has been answered in line 154.

- Why was a second endoscopy performed in intervention group? Couldn't you define dissolution rate by imaging, such as CT, in order to avoid a second intervention?

It has been answered in line 101-103.

- At which time point was evaluation for Gastric ulcer rate performed? During initial endoscopy? During follow up? This point should be further elucidated.

It has been answered in line 103-105.

Minor revisions

- Line 25 (on GPBs): a gap is missing

It has been rectified in line 25.

- Regarding intervention group, Coca Cola consumption is stated to last 7 days in the

abstract and 5 days in the main text. Please specify

It has been corrected in line 100.

- Line 25: abbreviation “GBs” is used without being introduced in the abstract

It has been corrected in line 21.

- Line 29: “were” is not correct

It has been deleted.

- Line 47-548: double use of the abbreviation instead of the full-term-should be corrected

It has been corrected in line 47,167,173-174,199 and 288.

- Regarding inclusion/exclusion criteria, it would be advisable to declare the decision process for patients with history of upper GI surgery or known history of peptic ulcer disease

It has been supplemented in line 82-84.

- How was bezoar volume measured? With endoscopy or imaging? Please explain

It has been supplemented in line 104-106.

- Authors use multiple times the full text “gastric phetobezoar” instead of GBP, e.g. in legend of figure 3, even after introduction of abbreviation. Please adopt a consistency

It has been corrected in line 173-174.

- In figure No 3, it is stated that “ the gastric ulcer became shallower”, obviously compared to Figure No2. However, it seems deeper. Please explain

The gastric ulcer became shallower compared to the image of the previous endoscopy.

- In line 193, the name of Gaya et al would be preferable mentioned, since otherwise the reader assess that the authors refer to the present paper

It has been corrected in line 201.

- Line 268: a gap is missing

A gap has been added.