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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

In order to appreciate the importance of conversion rate, the reader has to know the over-all selection for laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Hence, the number of open cholecystectomy done during the study (training and validation) periods must be given. Length of stay (over-night stay) for completed laparoscopic, converted laparoscopic, and open cholecystectomy should be given.

The proportion of emergency cases in the training and validation group differs fundamentally. I guess this is a writing error. If so, it must be corrected. If not, an explanation must be given.

**Discretionary Revision**

Which practical consequences can be drawn from this study? Are conversion risk calculated for the individual patient? What information, if any, is given to the patients after such calculations?

It is of interest to know if the authors have any experience of small-incision open cholecystectomy, which according best available evidence should be considered equal to laparoscopic cholecystectomy concerning recovery and complication.
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