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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract: The conclusion that IGB placement was safe with a satisfactory tolerance rate is not supported by the previous results. You should include some data related to tolerance and complications to say this. Introduction line number 5 the sentence is too long and with too many percentages. Change to for instance: This pandemia health..... 6-7 years. Moreover BMI correlates directly to life expectancy reduction, as a BMI of..... by 10 years respectively. Methods You say that patients below 18 years are excluded but age range is 14-65 in Table 1. Page 6 separate the words orpethidine, doneby and anesthesia using Page 7 Overnight fasting blood specimen........ for the estimation of BLOOD concentration( glucose). Explain better the follow-up of these patients: are clinic appointments scheduled?, are they on hipocaloric diets? Results Line 3 Eliminate SURGERY / Placement Table 2 Explain TDC Table 2: Could you make it more simple? I do not understand the difference between discomfort or abdominal pain, intolerance and vomiting.... What do you mean with other reasons? You must include the complication rate in the cohort and in the abstract too. At least 2 patients were operated on and three had a spontaneous deflated balloon. Are these complications related a longer time with IGB? Discussion You should describe the similarities or differences with
other IGB. As you describe it, it looks like BIB. You state that the more time IGB spent in the stomach, the more BMI reduction. But you do not mention if complications are higher or not. Some authors had reported that weight loss is higher in the first three months. You should discuss your results with theirs as you reported a higher BMI loss with longer intragastric time.