

Point-for-point response letter to reviewers comments:

Reviewer #1:

To the authors, General comments

1. *I am afraid you have not read the instruction for the author! Please, make corrections at the References. **The instructions for authors were followed and the references were corrected.***

2. *There are too many grammar/spelling errors throughout the text. Please, make corrections. **Corrections were made.***

Major concerns:

1. *Absrtract.*

It is confusing and should be rewritten.

If the aim of your review was “ to examine if patients with IBD have higher risk of psychiatric comorbidities after surgery compared with no IBD patients you should mention in the results how many of patients with diverticulitis, inghinal hernia or cancer were included in no IBD group.

Conclusion should be drawn more precisely, and refer to the aim of the review.

The abstract was re-formulated accordingly.

*Pay attention to t Crohn's disease!! **The spelling of Crohn's disease was corrected.***

2. *Core-tip is lacking. **Core-tip was added.***

3. *Key words is lacking. **Key words were added.***

4. Introduction.

Page 3, 3rd paragraph should be rewritten. **The paragraph have been rewritten.**

Last paragraph is rather confusing: "the objective of this review was to examine..." ... "this review assessed the following study questions..!"-**The paragraph re-formulated to present the objective of the review in separate study questions to make it easier for the reader to get an overview of the complex study field with very heterogeneous results.**

5. Methods,

Page 4: Inclusion criteria, last line "studies in all languages" (impossible!) **There was no language limitations in while conducting the search. However, only English language studies were found. This is re-formulated in the manuscript.**

Page 5,6: Please, give some details regarding study qualities assessment and publication bias (Egger's test, funnel plot?)-**This was described in supplementary materials.**

Important: statistical analysis is lacking; please, write it. **We haven't made any statistical analysis since the available studies were too heterogeneous to perform any meta-analysis. This was described in the manuscript.**

6. Results:

First paragraph:"risk of bias was assessed using NOS" (!) (NOS is for quality assessment!) **It was assumed that quality of evidence increases when the risk of bias decrease. The phrase was corrected in the text and figure.**

Outcomes (!) regarding depression/anxiety are confusing, difficult to be followed by the readers of the journal. **This was used due to heterogeneous nature of the included studies. We added supplementary material to explain the method.**

Crohn's disease. Please take attention how to write Crohn's disease!!! **This has been corrected.**

7. Discussion.

Page 10: rewrite first sentence , second paragraph "looking at patients...we only found results looking..."!! **This was rephrased.**

Page 11, the last three lines ("chicken or egg dilemma") should be deleted. **This was rephrased.**

8. Conclusion.

Page 12. I agree with the first sentence .

Key points: Charlson 's comorbidity instead of Carlson. **This was corrected.**

I regret I cannot recommend your manuscript to be published until a major revision dealing with the above mentioned comments is made.

*Reviewer #2: Please comment (discussion section) on the necessity to examine in future studies the psychiatric status of the same group of patients with IBD before and after the surgical intervention, in order the results to be more representative. **A comment on this was added to the discussion.***

Reviewer #3: Very well written study on a subject that few physicians take note of. The burden that IBD has on patients is well known for whoever treats these patients on a regular basis. Adding the stress of the surgical procedure to the already complex mental status of these patients can have a significant impact on patients lives. I commend the authors for a job well done !