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Reviewer's report:

The authors have made appropriate changes in the manuscript except for points mentioned below.

1. The authors have changed the effect-site concentration for remifentanil without highlighting the change. In the previous manuscript the effect site concentration for remifentanil was different in the two groups. "Effect site concentration was 2-6 μg/ml for both propofol and remifentanil. For patients in the DR group, anesthesia was maintained with 4-8% desflurane and an effect site concentration of 2-4 μg/ml remifentanil."

The changed version now reads as "The effect site concentration of remifentanil was 1-8 ng/ml for both groups."

This alteration in methodology is not appropriate.

2. Conclusion: The two sentences of the conclusion are at variance with each other. The first sentence states that PR is superior to DR. The second sentence says that DR provides similar field as PR. Please rewrite the conclusion.

3. Table 2 is in duplicate.

4. In Mean blood pressure figure, one P value =0.125 refers to which time-point? It would be best to write P>0.05 in the legend of the figure if all Ps are> 0.05 rather than one P value which is insignificant.

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

Unable to assess

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.

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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