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Reviewer's report:

General
According to the first review, the authors stated, that the patients could choose between the 'standard procedure (four ports)' and the alternative three port technique. This might be a reasonable answer to the question of patients selection.
The study includes a high number of patients, the data are presented well and the language is fine.
The paper might be published now.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

It is of my personel interest why the authors did not try do a real randomisation.

What next?: Accept without revision

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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