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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper and study is OK, but it is necessary to shorten text, especially abstract (250 words?!) and Discussion, because there are very often repetition of sentences, for example:

Seven years after surgery…. In Background and again In the Patients and methods.

I would delete in the Background because it is the method…

In conclusion of Abstract, the last sentence is necessary to delete : To our knowledge this is the first study evaluating postoperative quality of life….

It is the matter of style!

I have no word document, I would turn on track changes and emphasize the changes!
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**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no any competing interests!