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**Reviewer’s report:**

This is an interesting and novel paper describing the usability of a biomarker panel to exclude endoscopies before bariatric surgery in obese patients.

A drawback with the paper is that the authors do not systematically compare the biopanel test with the two golden standards EGDS and biopsies respectively.

It should be clearly stated that the biomarker panel (software-aided) classification of patients into healthy stomach (HS) and non-healthy stomach is tested against the two golden standards and that the paper (results, discussion) as well as the abstract structured accordingly (panel vs EGDS, panel vs biopsy results) followed by a symptoms results and discussion. A short summary of the biomarker panel software classification should be included in the methods section.

**Specific:**

Abstract - Rewrite and structure as suggested above. It is no meaning in doublewriting that the biomarker panel HS and NHS groups were classified according to biomarker profile as this is obvious and also not surprising that the groups profiles therefore were significantly different.

Methods - Add more on how the biopanel classification was performed by the software. Heading - add Histologi to EGDS heading

Result text - Structure comparisons of biomarker systematically a) panel results with EGDS and then b) panel with histology results with tables accordingly. Comment on the biomarker panel misclassification of panatrophy vs histology superficial gastritis (table 2).

Results - tables - Table 1 - move "n(%) from column to to table characteristics were relevant - e.g. females, concomitatnd disease et cetera. Table 3 - consider to present as supplementary table as software classification considers several biomarkers?? Change to "." instead of "," in p-value table.

Table 4 - Partially overlapping results with present table 2? Can all histology results be presented in table 2. Separate table on EDGS (as one of the golden standards) and biomarker panel as suggested above.
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