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Reviewer's report:

General
Revised version – comments

General
The manuscript has improved. However, the authors are convinced that one way forward in reducing hospital stay is a wider adoption of laparoscopic cholecystectomy although neither minilaparotomy cholecystectomy nor the concept of fast track surgery have been scientifically examined in their setting. These modalities must be taken into account when discussing strategies for an egalitarian health care system in the field of gallbladder surgery. In the end of the Discussion the authors state that if postoperative complications and medical resource utilization are comparable in laparoscopic and open cholecystectomy, then laparoscopic cholecystectomy would be advantageous because of less postoperative pain. It is, however, well recognised that bile duct injuries are more common in laparoscopic than in open cholecystectomy, for a recent review see Connor and Garden1. Further, all studies comparing minilaparotomy cholecystectomy and laparoscopic cholecystectomy have demonstrated that
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Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The final part of Conclusions in Abstract starting with “however, considering the substantially less postoperative pain…” must be removed, as they are speculations beyond findings of the present study.
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Minor essential revisions
I understand that the use of laparoscopic cholecystectomy is based upon completed LC:s, not upon completed and converted LC:s. This might be clarified in text
Charlson index is misspelt in Table 2

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests