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Author's response to reviews: see over
I am very pleased and delighted to hear from you again about the result of your respectful review on the manuscript # MS: 6936762101054703 - Administration of palonestron, granisetron, and ramosetron to prevent postoperative nausea and vomiting after laparoscopic gynecologic surgery: A prospective observational trial. We carefully reviewed and discussed about the comments provided by renowned expertise and have made extensive revisions on the manuscript. The list addressing each comment raised by the reviewer#3 and the corresponding changes are included below. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

[List of Revisions]

The list addressing each comment raised by the reviewer #3 and the corresponding changes are included below.

[Referee#3]

#1. The authors improved their English and the presentation in this revision. However, there are still places in the paper and in the responses to reviewers' comments where grammar and presentation need to be polished. The sentence in line 10-13 on page 5 is an example in the paper, In the responses to my previous comment #1, the authors claimed "we revised the syntax errors in the manuscript". But the issue I raised is not simply syntax errors. It is about inconsistency in numbers. I suggest that the authors find a good writer to help them proofread their paper and their responses before the next submission.

To this respectful and proper comment, we extensively revised the manuscript and incorrect percentages in Table 2 for clarity.

#2. Why is the caption of Table 3 "Change in ..." not "Number of ..."? More information should be provided about the tests used in this Table. For example, what are the tests that produce the p-values in the last column of this Table? Did the authors consider small numbers in the cells when performing the tests? Does their study have enough power to detect the differences in Nausea and Vomiting within 0-6 hours, 6-24 hours, and 24-48 hours respectively? If a complete responder is defined within 48 hours, why did not the authors performed the tests based on the number of Nausea or Vomiting within 48 hours?

Caption in Table 3 has been corrected as Referee suggested. As clearly stated in the METHOD section, statistical testing has been stated as: “Student’s t-test was used to compare the inter-group differences, and a chi-square test was used for categorical variables. P-values were corrected using the Bonferroni method.”

We agree with the small sample size and the corresponding results in this study. However, numerous studies have reported results with 30 to 40 patients per group[1][2][3]. As stated in the manuscript, this study has been consulted with a professional statistician for verification of total number of patients enrolled in each
group.

#3. I suggest that Table 2 and 3 be merged.
   We merged Table 2 and 3 as Referee suggested.
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[Editor’s Comments]

1. We have included the full name of our committee to approve this study.
2. Clinical trial registration number has been relocated just after the abstract.
3. We relocated the author’s contribution and competing interest after the conclusion as requested.