

**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.