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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript offers a modest but important contribution toward examining the effect of oxygenation during one lung ventilation.

It does need additional grammatical revision.

Some specific comments are included below:

Page 7 line 13, hospitals should be plural

Page 8, line 23: was delta p calculated as peak pressure minus PEEP, or plateau pressure minus PEEP for the 8% of patients on volume control ventilation?

Page 9, line 16: pneumothorax was not included as a PPC? i.e. need for insertion of a new chest tube after surgery?

Page 10, line 20: since you are looking at several variables, would it be appropriate to use a Bonferroni correction?

Page 14, line 53: remove the word "the" before "high FiO2"

Page 14, line 60: I don't think this 6 year-old textbook chapter should be described as "the latest recommendation"

Page 15, line 41: remove the last sentence in this paragraph, it makes assumption about the motivation of the providers, which is not supported by these data

Page 15, line 60, "a" conservative oxygen strategy….

Page 16, paragraph 1: this whole paragraph needs to be rewritten for grammatical accuracy

Page 17, line 41: consider replacing "majorly" with "heavily"

Page 17, line 41: don't say "their" definition. It is your definition.
Page 18, line 22: by your own admission, you did not establish causality with this observational study. I recommend changing the wording of this sentence to "high FiO2 was associated with an increased incidence of PPCs…"

Perhaps add a comment that there was low compliance with recommended standards to maintain a SpO2 92-94%

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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