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Author’s response to reviews: see over
To reviewer Richard Freeman:

Thanks for your suggestions.

1. Yes, the comparison may be confounded by the potential learning curve. But since this is not a prospective randomized study, direct randomized comparison is not possible. We added this concern in the end of the discussion section to remind the limitation of the study.

2. The description about the side of disease had been added to the manuscript.

3. In the introduction section, we had added the description of pressure gradient in paralytic diaphragm may progressively worsen the severity and why plication is required in the disease.

4. We added the Table II for a telephone contact to record their postoperative response. The preoperative lung function was not tested in all patients since most of them are tolerable to room air and had mild dyspnea. This is why we did not list the lung function test results in a table.

5. Thank you very much.

Dear Reviewer Gaetano Rocco:

Thanks for your suggestions and valuable opinions:

1. We realized that this is not a prospective and randomized study, which made the study limited in personal experience and opinion in a single institute. If possible, we will conduct a formal study on the issue.

2. We had added a short description on how running sutures can be made through an uniportal approach in the section of discussion. The procedure and how to avoid unexpected injury to the intra-abdominal organs.

Thank you very much.