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Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revisions:

1) Methods: P. 4, L. 18-: There is no need for the authors to describe their 2-incision VATS surgery development history, as they already did it in the Background section. Please describe only what the authors did in their 2-incision VATS surgery.

2) Results: Most percentage descriptions should be in natural numbers, because it is meaningless to describe decimal percentages based on a population smaller than 100 patients.

3) P. 5, L. 25-: I don’t think the authors need to start out from 78 patents, including 5 patients having undergone neoadjuvant chemotherapy or concurrent chemoradiotherapy, because the 5 patients underwent standard VATS lobectomy from the beginning.

4) P. 6, L. 11-: The authors included 2 patients who underwent preoperative adjuvant (should have been “neoadjuvant”) chemotherapy, although their relative contraindications included neoadjuvant chemo- or radiotherapy. What were the reasons why the authors performed 2-incision VATS in these patients? Their absolute contraindications included inability to achieve complete resection by lobectomy, but bilobectomy was performed in 3 patients and pneumonectomy in 1. Did the authors expect before they went in that the 4 patients’ diseases to be completely resected by lobectomy but find they needed further resection?

5) Discussion: P. 7, L. 13-: This paragraph is a simple repetition of what the authors already wrote in the Background and Methods sections and should therefore be simplified.

6) P. 8, L. 18: It should be clarified by which lobectomy the authors achieved this number, 22.1 ± 11.6, of dissected lymph nodes, 3-port VATS, through standard thoracotomy, or both.

7) P. 9, L. 1-: These are the key data to discuss learning curve and should be presented in the Results section.

8) P. 9, L. 13: It is not necessary to use the abbreviation “NOTES”, as it appears nowhere else.
9) Table 1: Percentage descriptions should be in natural numbers. I don’t think Table 2 is necessary.
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