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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Probably - with minor revisions
GENERAL COMMENTS: Overall Impression

I like the study, because it addresses a very real problem in the Middle Eastern countries. There are some problems with presentation and the design, but if corrected this will be a potentially important addition to the literature in bariatric surgery in this part of the world where obesity is a major problem.

The evaluations of eating and QUALITY OF LIFE are good and well analyzed.

What have the authors done well

The authors have done a good job in evaluating eating behaviors and QOL using multiple validated instruments (questionnaires); their results are believable in this population and they have analyzed them well.

In what ways does it not meet best practice

1. Unfortunately the questionnaires were not done preoperatively in the gastric band patients which limits the authors ability to compare changes preop and post op on that flgroup as they have done in the sleeve group and it is not clear whether the 28 day self reported eating behavior diary for the EDE-Q was given to the patients before they were evaluated in person.

2. It appears to me that the two groups were operated on in different time periods with the band patients being the first group and the sleeve patients being the second group- the authors do not define this but with only the sleeve group getting the questionnaires preoperatively, this leads me to suspect that they were operated on during different time periods- if so, then the post op followup would be different if all the patients were evaluated at the same time - this needs to be defined and discussed- this is potentially important because many of these QOL life variables change (get worse) during followup time.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

1. Change the phrase eating disorder behaviors to "behaviors of eating disorders"

2. Change the words bariatric surgery title to "laparoscopic gastric banding and sleeve gastrectomy" because these are the patients you studied. So be specific

3. Abstract line 19 change from "higher" to "better"
4. In abstract. If indeed the HRQOL was not significantly different, then do not claim that there was significant improvement in the sleeve gastrectomy group unless you are going to say that only the sleeve patients had a preop evaluation of these parameters. I really think you should say this so the reader will understand this sentence about pelted postop evaluation.

5. Introduction line page 3 lines 11 and 12 this does not make sense when compared to lines 8-10

6. Page 3 line 19. Change the word "immediately" to "early within several months" — immediately means just that and the QOL if measured one day postop would not be improved and probably not even at 2 weeks

7. Page 4 line 13. The phrase "reformed digestion and absorption" is not appropriate; change to "changes in digestion and absorption" and add calcium to that line as well

8. All the continuous data like age, changes in weight and BMI, etc need to be rounded off with less than 100 patients in each group, especially true in tables

9. It is unclear if the 2 groups of patients were operated over the same time period - I think probably not because the band group was not evaluated preoperatively. This can be a problem with comparing the groups, this needs to be clarified and explained in the text!

10. Page 7 line 20 specify that this was at postop evaluation as well as on page 9 line 7 and subsequently each time you discuss the group comparisons

11. Page 7 line 22 remind the readers that there were no preop evaluations of these parameters in the band group.

12. When I look at table 2 I am not certain whether a greater value in "Evaluation of different foods" means that the foods are better tolerated or worse tolerated. You better explain these as well as the overall score. Also the "overall satisfaction with food intake" of 3.2 +\- 1.0 vs 3.9 +\- 1.1 is not very impressive, maybe down play this category a bit

13. Round off the values in the tables to one decimal point only, will not change the results and it is more scientifically correct

14. Page 22 line 14 I would be careful about suggesting that mood is improved. There are several studies that show that depression (mood) does not improve postoperatively and that antidepressants need to be continued post operatively, stick with improved QOL but delete the mood reference

15. Page 14 lines 8 and 9. Did ALL the sleeve patients get evaluated preoperatively? This sentence suggests not. Therefore in the text you need to specify the data in response to this question. Also be specific - the band patients did not get evaluated preoperatively - say that! Also if the patients were operated on during different time periods (I suspect that the band
patients were operated first and the sleeve patients at a later date? Am I correct?) then this needs to be a limitation as well.

16. Finally I really think you need to report the followup for each group of patients especially if the band patients were operated on before the sleeve patients because the follow up periods may be different and greater in the band patients.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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