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Reviewer's report:

The authors describe the correlation with self reported physical activity to that of objective data obtained by accelerometer in patients post RYGB. Not surprisingly, the self reported data overestimates activity.

The information is limited by a small group and followup of only 38% long term. I find this unusual in a country such as Sweden which has a nationalized registry. What would be interesting is to compare those that chose to participate with any data from those that didn't. The actual differences in activity is in the range of minutes and not statistically significant. Were there subgroups that exercised more and had greater weight loss? Were there other comorbidities such as knee osteoarthritis that limited activity? What about activity that wasn't amenable to accelerometer where, such as swimming?

Do you have any information on lean body mass? For example, accelerometers may not pick up activity such as weight lifting or isometrics that could be beneficial.

Were there subgroups that were more accurate in their self assessment? Could these be picked up preoperatively?

As long as patients lose weight and their comorbidities improve, is it really necessary to worry about how active they are?

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

Yes

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

Yes

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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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