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Reviewer's report:

Comments for Editor and author:

Review of paper titled 'The learning curve of one anastomosis gastric bypass and its impact as a preceding procedure to Roux-en Y gastric bypass: initial experience of consecutive one hundred twenty cases'. Thank you for the invitation to review this interesting article.

Title:
Would suggest changing to "one hundred and five cases" as that are the number of patients analysed.

Abstract:
The abstract reads fine.

Introduction:
The introduction is well written.
Page 4, line 60 - Use terminology OAGB-MGB once in the beginning.
Line 70 - grammar : "ground to adopt"
Line 73- "Being short of prior"

Methods

Line 85 - delete "was enrolled".
Line 96 - delete "as studies went on mainly" and also delete "of"

Surgical technique:

Line 119 - "constructing"
Was gastrojejunostomy completely stapled? Or linear staple and then enterotomy closed with suture? Please clarify (as this might effect the marginal ulcer rate which you later on mention to be high. Also there was a case of GJ stenosis)
What was the average limb length in OAGB Group A and Group B?
Results:

Line 169- "significantly"
Line 174 - it is understandable that the operative time improved from 153 to 118 in group B and 115 in group C. However it is interesting that the RYGB (with 2 anastomosis and closer of mesenteric defect) took shorter time then group B? Any reason? Because author mentions that group B and group C were performed during the same years.
I am not sure whether 2 patients with nausea and other with mild fever can be labelled as complication. It is worth mentioning in the results but not worth showing them as complication.

%EWL of 92.9% at 1 year is very high! Any patient with malnutrition or anaemia? Any patient with excessive diarrhoea? (authors mention that all patients had nutritional survey. Give details if possible) Any patients in OAGB developed de novo reflux postoperatively? The author mentions that all patients had preoperative endoscopy. What was preop reflux and hiatus hernia rate? Did they offer patients with hiatus hernia OAGB or RYGB? The article would be robust if we have this data.

Discussion:

Discussion reads well.

Line 215 - "comparing"
Line 224 - delete "Consider"
Line 250 - replace much with "many"
Line 255 - replace readiness with "ready"
Line 276 - You can add that "Evidence shows that OAGB is safer and gives better weight loss compared to RYGB and SG in super obese patients as per the systematic review" : One Anastomosis Gastric Bypass in Morbidly Obese Patients with BMI ≥ 50 kg/m2: a Systematic Review Comparing It with Roux-En-Y Gastric Bypass and Sleeve Gastrectomy. Obes Surg. 2019 Sep;29(9):3039-3046.

Limitations:

Also include that follow up % was only 63% for RYGB at 1 year compared to over 80% for OAGB.

Would suggest writing separate conclusion. The last paragraph can be used for the same.

Would suggest correcting the English grammar throughout the manuscript please. Also correct the spacing and alignments please.

Decision:

My humble opinion is that the above points need to be robustly addressed. Would strongly encourage to resubmit after these revisions. Hope this is helpful.

Thank you.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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