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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting case and - in my opinion - worth to be reported for the final reason stated by the authors (164-170).

Overall, I would suggest shortening the manuscript a little bit as it contains some redundant and general information that is not necessary for the message that is easy and clear: 'be aware of the problem as it can seriously harm the patient'

1. I have two general questions:

1.1 Which kind of bougie / bougie material was used. Everybody knows there are different materials used that influence stiffness and therefore may have an impact on the perforation risk. There are soft bougies available for one-time-use, but they tend to be expensive.

1.2 Was a preoperative gastroscopy performed revealing a pathologic esophageal or gastric condition? The relevance of preoperative endoscopy should be shortly discussed.

2. I have some minor remarks:

2.1 L68: Please correct that there were no obvious complications.

2.2 L68-74: The description of clinical symptoms could be shortened.

2.3 L107-109: The last two sentences in "Literature Review" contain information regarding the results / discussion points. I would suggest to put this information and discussion of the sizes (i.e. used ranges) in the Discussion and conclusion section together with discussion point 1.1.

2.4 112-117: I suggest that the general information about bariatric surgery / LSG could be shortened.

2.5 L170 ff. ("The surgical management…") This is redundant and should be deleted. I would end the manuscript with L170 ("…delay.").

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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