Reviewer’s report

Title: Comparison of volume-controlled ventilation mode and pressure-controlled ventilation with volume-guaranteed mode in the prone position during lumbar spine surgery

Version: 0 Date: 18 Mar 2019

Reviewer: Aizhong Wang

Reviewer's report:

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.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

The patients with compromised cardiac and pulmonary diseases might get more benefit from PCV-VG mode than patient with normal cardiac and pulmonary function.

I think it should be accepted after minor revised.

41-43 line: there were lower Ppeak values in the PCV-VG group than in the VCV group (p = 0.045, Fig. 2).

Did Ppeak values including all time points in one group was compared with those of the other group? I think it is inappropriate. There were two factors (body position and ventilation mode) and should be compared separately.

45-47 line: Cdyn was lower in the VCV group than in the PCV-VG group (p = 0.040, Fig. 3)

Problem is same as mentioned above. The comparison in same group was to emphasize the difference of body position, The comparison between the two groups was to emphasize the difference of ventilation mode.
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