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Author's response to reviews:

The authors appreciate the editor for the postponement of the deadline of the revised manuscript. In addition, we would like to thank you for the thoughtful suggestions on this revised manuscript. We have revised the manuscript based on these suggestions. As a result, we believe that our manuscript is greatly improved.

Editor's comment:

1. The manuscript has been improved however, the most inconvenient issue is the fact that the critical sample size estimated to detect the difference in the primary outcome among the three study groups was not finally achieved. This indicates that the study was not powered to detect difference in the primary outcome.

A compensation for this shortcoming is the fact that the incidence of PONV was significantly reduced in the intervention group. The lack of difference between the two ondansetron groups could be related to inadequate sample size. Sample size limitation should be addressed in the methods shortcoming section of the discussion.

The authors agree with the comment and feel sorry for that. The following limitation was added in the discussion.

“Forth, minimal calculated sample size estimated to detect the difference in the primary outcome among the three study groups (46 patients per group) was not finally achieved because more patients than we expected have been dropped out during study period of the 4 centers. This may influence the statistical
significance in that the lack of difference between the two ondansetron groups could be related to inadequate sample size.” (Page 14, last paragraph)

2. I still wonder why the authors used a stethoscope to monitor temperature instead of a thermistor.

: Esophageal stethoscope with temperature sensor (thermistor) has three functions including cardiac sound, respiratory sound and core temperature monitoring intra-operatively. Insertion of esophageal stethoscope with temperature sensor is one of the conventional anesthetic practices in our institutions except for oral cavity surgery and temperature monitoring was done with esophageal stethoscope with thermistor. Therefore “esophageal stethoscope” was reworded with “esophageal stethoscope with thermistor”. (Page 7, 8th line)

3. I believe Bonferroni is not the post hoc test to be used, Student Newman Keuls test might more fit here.

: According to the comment, Student Newman Keuls test was used for post hoc test of continuous variables. The result with S-N-K test was the same with Bonferroni’s test and the method was changed with Student Newman Keuls test. (Page 9, 5th line)