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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory revisions:**
Thank you for a manuscript addressing one of the important aspects of non oncological thoracic surgery.
I have a few concerns regarding the manuscript in its current state.
1. The title thought attractive is not justified and is not withheld in the manuscript. The value of LVRS in Heterogenous emphysema has been well published. There are various aspects of benefits of LVRS which are published hence calling them controversial may not be justified.

2. You have chosen to selectively address certain issues in your analysis. You haven addressed the value of buttressing and there are RCTS which have shown their benefit.

**Minor essential revisions:**
The Bioglue vs Buttress was a pilot phase RCT and used Median sternotomy yet you are making a recommendation of VATS with Bioglue ( the company currently doesnt have a VATS applicator for BioGlue.

Abbrevations: PaO2: partial pressure of arterial oxygen. PaCo2 should be partial pressure of Arterial CO2

Introduction: Please remove An Obvious
Clarify that mostly conservative treatment is used rather than always please.

Point 3 Do you mean reduce heterogeniciy when you satte inhomogeneity?

Data sources and Searches
Do you mean Pneumectomy or pneumonectomy as both have completely different meanings

trail quality score should read trial quality score

The authors statte the different adjunts used but havent referenced them Is this a cross reference?

ThE RCT comparing Fibrin sealant did not compare it against buttress it was
bare stapples Vs fibrin sealant

I would recommend the authors consider and incorporate the following manuscript

It would be useful to browse the following references as they all support the value of LVRS in valuous forms


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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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