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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the chance to review a further draft of this interesting paper from Wei Tan and co-worker. I am really glad to the authors which accepted my suggestions and replied to my questions and points of view, integrating the original draft. I wish the editor will find the paper improved as I do. I read with great interest all the replies provided. Nonetheless, I found something to be considered in the text, described as follow:
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The authors state that "Patients were routinely sent to the PACU followed by intravenous administration of atropine sulfate 0.02 mg/Kg and neostigmine 0.04 mg/Kg for reversal of muscle relaxation, and the staff worked in PACU monitored and removed the tracheal tube when the TOF ratio < 25%.”

Well, since many international guidelines coming from several scientific societies in the world agree to recommend safe extubation only when TOF ratio > 90%, I am pretty confident to state that maybe the authors made a mistake during the revision of the original draft. Anyway, I recommend to keep this point in consideration to improve the text.

Eventually, I find that English language in the text may need to be improved.

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

Yes

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.

Yes

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.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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