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Comments

This is a retrospective study to find the application of intra-operative ventilation done by anaesthesiologists as a single study. It involved 73 responders. Although, they had more than ten thousand patients involved during the study period, they were mostly excluded due to missing data.

Overall, it is a good study although there are a lot of limitations to discuss.

As the authors have discussed in the discussion part, given that this is a retrospective review.

First, the limitation of actual practice from the questionnaire survey, the answers and actual practice may different. The questionnaires were given to predominantly junior anaesthesiologists such as residents, fellows, of which most would have trained in the era of lung-protective ventilation but the decision on the patient management would depend on staffs.

Secondly, the definition of LPV (VT < 10 mL/kgIBW and PEEP ≥ 5 cmH2O) may not apply to other study in LTV - ARDS.

Thirdly, the retrospective study involves many uncontrolled co-factors—including intake
fluid, operation time, blood products, and type of surgery and intravenous fluid—which cannot be controlled in this study.

Also, the study may benefit to further analyse by category of different level of training and answers that may effect the results.

Lastly, the author mentioned that there is no previous study that look at intra-operative mechanical ventilation lung strategy during anesthesia. Actually, there was at least one recent study done by Guldner, A et al that look at intraoperative protective mechanical ventilation for prevention post-operative complications.1
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