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Reviewer's report:

This is a revised version of the original manuscript. The authors dealt with some of the issues raised by reviewers. The manuscript has been improved and some of the issues were clarified, but the text still bears a couple of major limitations.

First, using PaO2/FiO2 from two time points only is not very representative for lung injury. The authors in their response admit that some patients were discharged earlier than 7 days after the surgery (which is clear from Table 4), thus what happened to the values from these patients - were collected/analyzed or not?

Second, information regarding duration of postoperative mechanical ventilation, extubation in OR or ICU (how long after the end of surgery), early postoperative care, the length of ICU stay etc. is not available, albeit it is extremely important for this type of clinical study; in fact, many of these parameters should be included as secondary outcome parameters.

Third, the authors added the description of how HPC was performed (3 cycles for totally 24 minutes) [P6/L117-120]. Information about using intermittent two-lung ventilation when SpO2 <92% despite FiO2 1,0 during OLV should be included in the description of methods.

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

No

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 recommend additional statistical review
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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