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Reviewer's report:

Again, I appreciate the substantial amount of work that the authors have done in providing a significant revision. The manuscript is improved again. After reading the last revision, I’ve only few recommendations:

P.13 L30: please add information about the used vasopressors/catecholamines here (i.e. norepinephrine/dobutamine etc).

P.14 L42: please add information about the kind of volatile anesthetics and the MAC (i.e. Sevoflurane, MAC 0.8 to 1.0)

Additionally, there seems to be different informations in table 1/2 and your response on page 4 where you have written: "The length of ICU stay was 25 (20 - 43) days (median and interquartile range) in the ARDS group, and was 21 (11 - 44) days in the control group. In the 15 patients with ARDS who had received thoracic surgery during this admission, the reintubation rate was 46%, the mean ventilator free hour was 54 hours, and the rethoracotomy rate was zero." I think, in the first part of your response you are talking about "survivors" and "non-survivors". Furthermore I cannot find the Information about the ventilator free hours of the ARDS group in the table. Please add this Information into table 1.

Tables: please delete the word "perioperation" from the tables.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
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