PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 84788

Title: Long-term effectiveness, outcomes and complications of bariatric surgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-01 16:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-01 16:05

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The discussion section is modest. 3. Abstract: not properly written. 4. Conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 84788

Title: Long-term effectiveness, outcomes and complications of bariatric surgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03034605

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MCh, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Attending Doctor, Chief Doctor, Consultant Physician-Scientist, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-02 02:05

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-10 15:38

Review time: 8 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have written a minireview on the long-term outcomes and complications of bariatric surgery. I have following comments regarding the manuscript: Major issues 1. There should be a table summarizing the long-term outcomes of weight loss from different studies including their follow up period and a separate table summarizing the long-term complications, their incidence and their management.   2. The management of the long-term complications must be discussed in detail.   Minor issues   1. In the lines "Chierici et al. [34] included 39 papers in their systematic review and meta-analysis to demonstrate that biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch provides the best weight loss results (1 and 3 years), (total weight loss 12.38 and 28.42), followed by single-anastomosis duodenoileal bypass (9.24 and 19.13), one-anastomosis gastric bypass (7.16 and 13.1), and Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (4.68 and 7.3) were all superior to re-sleeve gastrectomy. " what does the numbers in the brackets mean?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 84788

Title: Long-term effectiveness, outcomes and complications of bariatric surgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-18 16:32

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-18 16:33

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors addressed all of my comments. The revised manuscript can be accepted for final publication.