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Reviewer's report:

Dear Dr. Torbjorn Sakari,

compliments for your manuscript, it's undoubtedly a subject of great interest.

I nevertheless have some observations about it:

- The aims of the study are clear in the closing paragraph of introduction and consistent with the development of the manuscript, but the title is focused only on outcomes.

- The abstract, especially conclusions, does not faithfully reflect the full text conclusions.

- The chapter "Patients" at page 7, in my opinion, would be more appropriate in the section "Results".

- Cardiovascular disease is a generic definition. Did you include hypertension? Could you better define subcategories for this co-morbidities?

- I didn't understand the line 20-23 at page 7: "In all 50% had cardiovascular disease and 48% had an ASA class (...) of 3 or 4." Why did you correlate these two informations?

- Among the type of surgery, reported in Table 2, it would be interesting to distinguish laparoscopic vs laparotomic type of surgery and its correlation with SBO development.

- About results at line 23-52 at page 10, my suggestion is reporting this data in a Table, to make them more intelligible.

- Why didn't you consider a multivariate analysis as a statistical method?

- In "Conclusion" chapter to much data are reported, while conclusions from the abstract seem more appropriated.

- Conclusions about the mechanism for SBO are missing.

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.

No

**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

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