

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55509

Title: The Outcome of Pregnancy Following Bariatric Surgery in Women Attending a Secondary Care Hospital

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Date: 31.12.25

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study

- The study addresses an important and timely topic related to maternal and neonatal outcomes following bariatric surgery.
- It provides comprehensive data on nutritional deficiencies, obstetric complications, and neonatal parameters in a regional population, contributing valuable insights to the region-specific literature.
- The methodology includes a sizable retrospective review over a broad period, with detailed data collection on sociodemographics, nutritional status, and pregnancy outcomes.
- The analysis incorporates multivariate statistical methods, enhancing validity.
- The paper discusses clinical implications, emphasizing the need for multidisciplinary care and preconception counseling.

Weaknesses of the Study

- The sample size, especially after exclusions, limits the statistical power to detect associations or differences between subgroups, such as different types of bariatric procedures.
- The retrospective design introduces potential bias and confounders that are not fully controlled.
- Lack of a control group (e.g., pregnant women without prior bariatric surgery) restricts comparative interpretation of outcomes.
- Some key data points, such as exact nutritional supplementation regimens and compliance, are not detailed, which could influence results.
- The broad heterogeneity in surgery types and the high percentage of unclassified procedures limit specific conclusions.
- Certain statistical analyses, such as the lack of detailed multivariable adjustment or subgroup analysis, may limit interpretability.
- Ethical considerations are briefly mentioned; clarity on informed consent procedures and ethical approval processes is needed.
- Figures and tables are mentioned but not included in the provided text, making it difficult to evaluate the presentation quality fully.

Reviewer Comments

- The title clearly reflects the content but could be improved for clarity by specifying “perinatal outcomes” or similar.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- The abstract sufficiently summarizes objectives, methods, results, and conclusions but should explicitly mention the retrospective nature and the study setting.
- The Introduction is well-structured and provides relevant background; however, the objectives would benefit from a more precise statement of hypothesis or specific outcomes of interest.
- The methodology is generally appropriate but requires clarification on how data quality was assured and whether standardized protocols were used for nutritional assessment.
- The statistical analysis description is clear; however, further elaboration on how potential confounders were handled would strengthen the paper.
- Results are presented comprehensively; however, the inclusion of p-values or confidence intervals for key associations, especially regarding nutritional deficiencies and neonatal outcomes, would enhance interpretability.
- The discussion contextualizes findings well; however, some points, such as the absence of correlation between surgery-pregnancy interval and outcomes, warrant deeper exploration.
- The conclusion accurately summarizes key findings but should emphasize limitations and future research directions more explicitly.
- Ethical clearance appears to be obtained, but detailed information such as the approval authority, clearance number, and steps taken to secure informed consent should be explicitly stated.
- The manuscript's language is generally clear but contains some grammatical and typographical errors that require careful editing.
- References are relevant and well-cited, but in-text numbering consistency and complete formatting should be verified.