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Reviewer’s report:

Good idea - not new. The references do not reflect the amount of literature already written on single port or uniportal VATS. In this setting, the authors should resist the temptation to plant a flag and focus on the real advantages of their technique.

The authors should avoid comparing two groups in a retrospective fashion measuring a subjective entity like pain to establish the superiority of one procedure over the other. A carefully designed, CONSORT compliant, randomized trial is necessary.

Also, many technical issues are taken for granted. If simple stitching of the eventrated diaphragm to the healthy portion is not possible due to the severity of the condition, the authors suggest that multiple -running - sutures should be used. They should explain how to achieve this through uniportal VATS by ensuring at the same time protection of the intraabdominal organs.

In my opinion, the paper should undergo major compulsory revision in order for the conclusions to support the title of the manuscript.
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