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The authors have attempted to evaluate surgical field visibility during middle ear surgery for cholesteatoma. Consenting patients were randomized and the surgeons were blinded. The patients were divided into two groups of 40 each - 1 group received propofol as the main anesthetic and the other received desflurane. Remifentanil was used for both groups. Both groups received ondansetron and dexamethasone for PONV prophylaxis. At one point during the surgery the authors report that surgical field visibility was significantly better in the propofol group. The following needs explanation:

1. The numbers are too small to make this as a far reaching conclusion. With larger numbers would the surgical field would have been scored better earlier on in the propofol group?

2. What was the reason tachycardia was not observed in the desflurane group?

3. How come the incidence of PONV was similar in both groups?

4. Since there is less vasodilation with propofol as compared to desflurane as the authors indicated, did the surgeons find more bleeding (microscopic) in the desflurane group?

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
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