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Reviewer’s report:

I read with interest the comments of authors. The manuscript has been improved. First of all, Regarding the point reported (page 6, lines 8-9) I believe that the seven cases should be eliminated. it is not clear the palliative treatment in this contest. I appreciated the description of the rate of symptoms and the general anesthesiological management but I think authors should clarify the effective role of the anesthesiologist in this work. In view of last point I am unable to express an opinion fully favorable to consider publishing the work and I think that take into account this relevant point and may be very interested for the future reader.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? yes
3. Are the data sound? yes
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? unassessable
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? only partially
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? yes
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? In the title reported “ outcome” but in contrast with a comments of the authors that reported “We did not focus on the symptom control itself….
10. Is the writing acceptable? yes

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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