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Reviewer's report:

Zhou and co-workers presented a prospective randomized controlled clinical trial with the aim to determine the optimal dose of pretreated-dexmedetomidine in fentanyl-induced cough suppression.

The main criticism of this study in my opinion is the missing scientific approach. It is more scientific to elucidate why an increase in synthetic opioid blood concentration induces a cough, instead of conducting studies about reducing its clinical frequency.

The frequently associated induction of cough is usually neither harmful for the patient nor bothersome. Promising strategies in order to achieve the aim of cough suppression consist for instance of decreasing the injection speed in conjunction with pre-administration of lidocaine.

In a recent meta-analysis Wu et al. (Int J Clin Exp Med 2016;9(5):7655-7667) published that the lowest effect dose of dexmedetomidine for preventing the prevalence of OIC was 0.1 μg/kg.

In conclusion, the data from Zhou et al. are not really new and original.
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