

1. Clarity of the Research Question

The research question—evaluating modifications of the STOP-Bang questionnaire in lower-BMI patients—is clearly stated. However, the novelty should be emphasized more explicitly in the introduction. Please highlight how your study fills a unique gap compared to prior STOP-Bang validations.

2. Background and Literature Review

The background is adequate, but you may wish to expand the discussion of previous STOP-Bang validations in Asian or lower-BMI populations. This will better contextualize the rationale for your modification.

3. Study Population Description

While demographic and baseline characteristics are provided, the description of inclusion/exclusion criteria could be expanded. For example, how were comorbidities handled? Were there any patients excluded after screening?

4. Sample Size Justification

The manuscript does not provide a clear justification for the chosen sample size. Please include either a power calculation or a discussion on whether the sample was sufficient to detect meaningful differences.

5. Methodological Rigor

The study design appears sound, but the process of modifying the STOP-Bang (i.e., which items were adjusted and why) should be described in greater detail for reproducibility. A step-by-step explanation would be valuable.

6. Statistical Analyses

The analyses are appropriate, but some additional clarity is needed. For example, when reporting sensitivity, specificity, and AUC, please provide 95% confidence intervals. This would strengthen the robustness of your findings.

7. Results Presentation

Results are generally well presented, but tables could be streamlined for clarity. In particular, Tables comparing the original vs. modified STOP-Bang should more clearly highlight performance differences (perhaps bolding the superior values).

8. Figures and Visuals

Figures are helpful but somewhat basic. Consider adding ROC curves to visually demonstrate the performance of the original and modified STOP-Bang tools. This would strengthen the manuscript's presentation.

9. Interpretation of Findings

The discussion interprets the findings reasonably, but the authors may wish to expand on the clinical implications. For instance: How would the modified tool impact screening practices in low-BMI populations?

10. Limitations

The limitations section should be expanded. Particularly:

- Single-center design
- Relatively small sample size
- Potential selection bias due to referral population

A transparent acknowledgment will improve the manuscript's credibility.

11. English and Style

Overall, the manuscript is readable, but several sentences are awkwardly phrased. For example, in the results and discussion sections, there are minor grammatical issues that could be smoothed with professional editing.

12. Future Directions

The manuscript would benefit from a brief statement on next steps. For example, the need for external validation in multi-center studies, or testing the modified STOP-Bang in community/primary care settings.