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Reviewer's report:

This is an important reminder to thoracic anesthesiologists that a long pulmonary vein stump after lung lobectomy is a risk factor for postoperative thromboembolic complications, especially after left upper lobe lobectomy. When it occurs immediately after surgery, patients with an epidural catheter for pain control will be troublesome considering urgent treatment with intravascular therapy and anti-coagulation drugs. Readers will find this case report informative and relevant to their clinical practice.

Minor suggestions are listed for the authors as follows:

1. Please specify it was a lobectomy procedure or wedge resection? Since LUL lobectomy leaves a longer PV stump than any other lobes, it is an important factor for thromboembolic complications. Please clearly specify the lobe and procedure type (both in text and title).

2. Please check the staging of previous diagnosis of colon cancer. While TNM staging was T3N1aM1a, which was not compatible with stage IIA. Please clarify.

3. By latest ASRA guideline (April, 2018), recommended time interval before epidural catheter removal is 1 hour to at least 6 hour for different anti-coagulation medications. In this case, 1 hour is acceptable according the recommendations. I suggest this recommendation can be mentioned in the discussion.

4. While this complication can happen months later, the efficacy of routine postoperative systemic anti-coagulation prophylaxis may not be conclusive. I believe this answer should depend upon results from randomized trials.
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.

Unable to assess

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

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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