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| Reviewer Comment | Author Comments | Manuscript Revisions |
| ***Reviewer A:*** | | |
| The topic is of importance and the manuscript is generally well written. However, while the aim was to cover the impact of age, ethnicity and socioeconomy on access to and complications after bariatric surgery, the study only evaluates ethnicity thoroughly. I would suggest the authors to limit their manuscript to focus only on this topic. | Thank you for your comment. We agree that age is not well explored and have removed that from the paper. We do feel as though we have highlighted areas of ehtnoracial disparities as well as those relevant to SES and access. | Aim revised |
| In the methods section, please provide the exact dates for the literature search (January 2000-July 31 2022 ??) and a short motivation as to why studies before the start date was not considered. | Thank you for the comment. The search was completed from August 1, 2022 – December 31, 2022 of papers written between the dates of January 1, 2000 – December 31, 2022. | Dates updated for clarity |
| Lines 131-133 are repeating the first line in the same section (lines 120-122), please revise. | Thank you for the comment. The duplication has been deleted for clarity. | The duplication has been deleted for clarity. |
| On page 9, lines 207, 209 and 211, please exclude the p-values. P-values were not presented for other studies and are not really of relevance for the present manuscript. | Thank you for the comment. The p values have been deleted. | P values deleted |
| ***Reviewer B:*** Many thanks for the opportunity to review this manuscript. You have made a good effort to establish a story about the impact of many factors including ethnicity on the outcomes of bariatric surgery.  My main feedback is that some work needs to be done to make your story congruent throughout the abstract, intro, methods, results and conclusion. Perhaps you need to reduce the number of variables you are examining as there appears to be perhaps too many, which clouds the story. Your aim should match your methods, outcomes and conclusions.  Suggest perhaps focusing on ethnicity and socio-economic status. The others mentioned (age, access to care, genetics, etc etc) seem to muddy the waters a little. They should be mentioned as variables that impact things but as main outcome measures, perhaps not.  My overview is that perhaps the sheer number of variables is detracting from the authors being ability to succinctly tell the story. The writing style and structure of paragraphs also need some work. The end sentences of your paragraphs often do not add necessary information and appear to be 'add-ons' for no particular reason. See below for my specific feedback. | | |
| Title:  Appears a little vague - needs more clarity - 'in the treatment of surgery' appears to mean how surgery is treated? Suggest 'impact of access to and outcomes of bariatric surgery' or similar | Thank you for your comment. | Disparities in the impact of access to and outcomes of bariatric surgery among different racial and socioeconomic populations: A Narrative Review of the Literature |
| Abstract:  In the background you have stated that there is a 'disproportionate burden of obesity and diabetes', this needs to be more specific - what kind of burden? what are the stats? are there increased rates of diabetes in certain populations? which ones? need to set the scene more effectively as to why you need to do this lit review. "Existing literature demonstrates reduced weight loss" - do you mean less effective weight loss strategies? Better wording required. "Normalisation of weight loss variation" this is also hard to understand, perhaps phrase this more clearly, are you talking about weight-regain post-surgery? The Conclusions is unclear- no conclusions are made about what you found here. What was your main finding and what does this mean for the field? 'These factors' are mentioned but the conclusion should conclude what these factors are. | Thank you for your comment. Word choice changed to assist in ease of reading. |  |
| Introduction:  The aim of the study and the aim stated in the abstract are not the same. Suggest marrying these up for consistency. Also, are you only talking about the US here? What is your specific population? | Thank you for the comment. This has been revised. | The purpose of this review is to demonstrate the impact of race and ethnicity on access to bariatric and metabolic surgery as well as postsurgical outcomes including weight loss, comorbidity remission, complications and mortality. |
| Methods:  'a combination of disparities.. etc' is very vague. I don't know what you searched for?  Line 130-131 - the study had what limitations? It seems like a large cohort (71,679) meta-analysis which showed no difference in outcomes between populations, the limitations are very important to uncover here, if there are any. | We have updated this for clarity. | The search terms used to conduct the search included bariatric surgery in conjunction with the follow words or phrases: disparities, outcomes, complications, mortality, access to care or socioeconomic factors. |
| Line 232 - 'exam' ? - spelling error  Line 246 - For non-Americans, terms like Medicaid are not easily understood - need to define what this is  Line 249 'though' ? - spelling error  Line 281 - can’t start a sentence with a numeral | Medicaid has been described. Spelling errors and grammatical errors have been fixed. | Appropriate changes made to text |
| Line 288-line 293. Not sure Familial Support as you have explained here fits in with the rest of the literature review. Is familial support affected by ethnicity or socioeconomic status? If you include familial support you need to link it more closely with the variables you are examining. | Thank you for your comment. You are correct this was not well fleshed out and has been deleted from the text. | Text deleted. |
| ***Reviewer C:*** | | |
| 1- The authors should clarified if the perform a systematic vs a narrative review. | Thank you for your comment | This is a narrative review. |
| 2- Descriptive table of most relevant studies should be added. | Thank you for your comment. | Table has been added. |
| 3- The authors reported data with the laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding procedure. This reviewer is confused regarding the usefulness of that data knowing that this procedure is no longer used on a wide scale. | Thank you for the information. As this is a review, we felt the historical procedure was relevant for completeness. | No change |
| 5- Tables should be added. The reader should be able to have a sense of the data by looking at the Tables which should be incorporated by section if a summary per section and a final conclusion at the end of the paper with a Limitation section before the Conclusion section. | Thank you for your comments. As this is a narrative/literature review the strengths and limitations of the papere are not discussed. We have added a summary table of the most relevant studies included in the paper. | We have added a summary table of the most relevant studies included in the paper. |