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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. For the study with basically negative results the power analysis is necessary to ascertain the statistical power of results. The authors justify the lack of the formal statistical power analysis by the statement that the study was 'descriptive'. I am not sure how the study is classified as 'descriptive', when in fact it was prospective, randomized design. In fact, in the discussion part, they claim that the study was underpowered - how they now this without statistical analysis. I believe that at least post hoc power estimation should be included (despite all its drawbacks).

2. Not sure why only females were enrolled. It should be significant bias in the interpretation of results and the limitation of the study. It is my understanding the the study was open for both genders. This limitation should be stated and discussed.

3. The timing of administration of ondansetrone is in according to old FDA guidelines but contrary to the most recent PONV Guidelines just published in A&A by some of the authors. Why this discrepancy?

4. I am a bit puzzled by the aim of the study. The authors declare in this paper (and also in mentioned before guidelines) that the PONV rescue should be from different group of medication that used in prophylaxis. In this respect the results are not unexpected at all. If they wanted to have some type of positive control, they should rather use, instead of ondanestron (not effective by definition) some other antiemetic from different group.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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