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Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

The manuscript by Lee et al. describes prospective, randomized clinical trial compared the hemodynamic and pulmonary variables of volume-controlled ventilation (VCV) and pressure-controlled ventilation with volume guaranteed mode (PCV-VG) in 36 patients undergoing spine surgery in the prone position. The hemodynamic variables and arterial blood gas results did not differ between CCV and PCV-VG. Lower Ppeak values were observed in the PCV-VG group than in the VCV group \((p = 0.045)\). The Cdyn values in the VCV group were lower than those in the PCV-VG group \((p = 0.040)\).

It is unclear to me why the authors have defined T0, T1, T2, and T3. I would prefer that they simply be recorded as 15 minutes after positioning, 30 minutes after positioning, etc. It is less confusing to the reader. I would prefer this in all the Tables and Figures.

Overall this manuscript is not sufficiently novel. It already known that pressure-controlled ventilation produces lower Ppeak values and higher Cdyn values. Doing this in prone patients undergoing spine surgery does not sufficiently improve the novelty to merit publication.

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