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Reviewer’s report:

The present work investigates the prevalence of psychiatric disorders among Chinese patients who sought obesity treatment. The study is interesting in that it aims to replicate published epidemiological studies done in other countries, thus allowing the possibility to compare these data.

However, I think that some aspects need to be clarified.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The Results section starts with the number of patients reviewed (n=1832). If I understand correctly, these are patients that had CHQ and TDQ scores above the cut-off points and were referred for a psychiatric interview. How many of the patients that were tested had scores that were below the cut-off point for both scales? What is the total number of the patients that were tested with the CHQ and the TDQ?

2. The authors correctly emphasize the importance of addressing the psychiatric comorbidity of obesity for a multidisciplinary, integrated treatment. For this reason, it is puzzling that 47% of the patients that underwent the initial evaluation and were found to present significant psychopathology at the psychometric tests refused to see a psychiatrist, thus making treatment of any psychiatric illness impossible. Since this is a significant part of the initial sample (868 out of 1832), I think this issue needs to be discussed in more detail. Were these patients different in CHQ and TDQ scores compared to the patients who accepted to be evaluated by the psychiatrist? If these data are not available, it should be stated as a limitation of the study in the discussion. Can the authors make any hypothesis to explain such a high attrition rate?

3. The results section at page 9 needs to be clarified. The text says that “surgical patients were more likely to have a mood disorder”. This seems in contradiction with another statement that can be found some lines below: “surgery patients had more eating disorders than non-surgical patients, but there was no difference in mood disorders”. Looking at the figures in table 3 I understood that the first sentence refers to the category “other mood disorder”, while the second refers to “mood disorders” of any kind. I think this is confusing and should be explained more clearly in the text (perhaps stating that the prevalence of the category “other mood disorders” was higher in surgical patients for the first category and using a terminology like “all mood disorders” for the second category).

4. In the same Results section the authors state that “in overall psychiatric
disorders, surgical patients still had a higher prevalence, with moderate significant (54.1% versus 38.6%, p=0.068)”. Usually, the null hypothesis (no difference between groups) is rejected at p<0.05, so p=0.068 should be considered not significant, unless the authors have very strong reasons to use a different significance level.
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