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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is a retrospective review of the experience of the authors with three and four port cholecystectomy.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1) Though the authors say that verbal pain scale was used, it may make their case stronger, if they can show the pain scale chart for both the groups and see whether there is any statistical difference. 2) The authors state that patients were discharged as per the hospital discharge policy. It will become more clear for the readers if authors state exactly the criteria for discharge from hospital for patients undergoing cholecystectomy. 3) There is need to tabulate the data separately for patients with acute cholecystitis undergoing surgery and compare both groups

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
It will be interesting to note what has been the effect of this study on the day to day practice of the authors with regard to cholecystectomy. Based on this experience, are the authors routinely practicing 3 port technique? If so, the authors may mention the same in their conclusions.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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