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Reviewer's report:

Dear editor

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the paper "Prevalence and predictors of irritable bowel syndrome in patients with morbid obesity: a cross-sectional study »

The main objective of the paper was "to study the prevalence of irritable bowel syndrome and other functional bowel disorders in patients with morbid obesity, and to search for predictors of irritable bowel syndrome."

Major remark:

Although the methodology of the paper is good, the assumption for the prevalence of IBS of 8.4% in the general population from the same area is actually true for the group of patients recruited in the Oslo University Hospital Aker, table 1 (8%) although authors expected higher rates. This group accounted for 60% of the patients that were included in the study.

Patients with morbid obesity that were recruited from the Innlandet Hospital Trust Gjøvik (same table) had a 26% prevalence of IBS a result that matched the results that were previously published as used in the design of the study.
The presence of this heterogeneity makes it impossible to use data from both of these 2 centers and the result is driven by the Innlandet Hospital Trust Gjøvik which accounts also for the minority of the inclusions. I would suggest to increase the number of inclusions in order to avoid this obvious selection bias. The difference between the 2 groups can be seen also in table 3.

Minor remarks

There are small differences in ethnic origin and I would suggest that ethnicity should not to be included in the logistic regression model.

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.

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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