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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for your revision. Although you have tempered your conclusion in several places I am still troubled that the primary conclusion in the abstract and in the discussion (p11. l50) overstates the clinically important differences (or lack thereof) between groups. PR anesthesia resulted in surgical visibility scores that were statistically, but not clinically different. This is an excellent example of how we have become altogether too focused on p values while losing the focus on the clinical importance of our study results (see Wasserstein et al. American Statistician 2019. [https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2019.1583913](https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2019.1583913)). I think that there should be a sentence in the discussion that clearly explains that the threshold of clinical difference with the Boezaart scale that was set for the study was not reached.

Other minor comments:

p8, l30: was the PACU anesthesiologist blinded to the study or to the group assignment in the study?

p12, l57: should be seldom (not "seldomly")

p12, conclusion: "in summary" is not needed- begin the sentence with "Although", and delta the comma after desflurane.
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