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Reviewer's report:

I have a number of questions about the study.

1. Combining the 26 subject from outside the BCNA seems to complicate the study. I would be better to include only one group.

2. The statistical analyses are all parametric. No evidence of normality of the data are provided and it seems likely with this kind of data that a non-parametric analysis would be much preferred.

3. The time from diagnosis to surgery ranged very widely with a mean of 8.2 years and a range of 1 to 32 years. Some kind of metric is needed to standardize the data, otherwise the effect of duration is an unknown. It would be better to measure the weight gain for the first 5 years, e.g., from diagnosis or the 5 years prior to surgery.

4. Not much is made of the variables that were measured. What was the relation between the Likert scale data and weight gain? This seems to have been ignored in the analysis. If the number of subjects is sufficient, it would be interesting to determine whether there was a difference between patients who received chemotherapy and those who did not. There seems to be an approximately even split there. Also, was weight gain different between those who were premenopausal or postmenopausal at the time of diagnosis? Again, the split is almost even.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review
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