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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript 'Effect of low dose naloxone on the immune system function of a patient undergoing video-assisted thoracoscopic resection of lung cancer with sufentanil controlled analgesia — a randomized controlled trial.' indicates an important phenomenon that opioids receptor blockers could improve immune function through OGF, natural killer cells, and CD4+/CD8+ T cells, which could be useful for these area, but the manuscript still has several problems need revision.

1. "CD4+/CD8+ T cell ratio" would be better than just "CD4+/CD8+".

2. Please explain why the visual analog scales for pain at rest and while coughing are different, for the pain at rest, the difference happens at 12 and 24 hours after surgery, but for the pain at coughing, the difference happens at 48 hours after surgery.

3. In the first paragraph of discussion, the author has mentioned that the NK cells activity is important for the immune-regulation and tumor development. Thus, if the activities of the NK cells in both groups are provided, the results would be better.

4. The authors should discuss the relationship between NK cells and CD4+/CD8+ T cells during perioperative context, as well as their effects on postoperative tumor development.

5. There are multiple spelling mistakes, need to be revised.
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