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Author’s response to reviews:

Response letter

Q: We request that a point-by-point response letter accompanies your revised manuscript. This letter must provide a detailed response to each reviewer/editorial point raised, describing what amendments have been made to the manuscript text and where these can be found (e.g. Methods section, line 12, page 5). If you disagree with any comments raised, please provide a detailed rebuttal to help explain and justify your decision.

Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style, which can be found at the Submission Guidelines on the journal homepage.

Response: We thank all the reviewers and editor for their constructive criticism and suggestions. We have addressed all the points raised by the reviewer as follow.

Editor Comments:

The main concern – as highlighted by both reviewers – is that you worked under the hypothesis of a high effect size (50% to 25%) which did not occur. This seems to be mostly due to a poor effect of dexmedetomidine, which was unable either to reduce morphine consumption. You explain this by a low need of postoperative morphine, this is partially true as 14mg in the first day is not null in middle-aged ladies, and anyway you still had a 53% rate of 24hr PONV in the control group, quite in accordance to the Apfel’s risk. In your paper referenced n°8 (Eur J Anaesth 2016), it seems that the same thing happened: you expected a 50% reduction of risk, while it was actually 10%. It therefore seems more sensible to justify this expected size effect by stating that it corresponded to a clinically meaningful effect, but on the other hand you should
state that – despite possible trends – you failed to evidence this meaningful antiemetic effect. All your conclusions should be restated in this way.

Response: We followed this suggestion and change to the manuscript was indicated in the text by highlighting. Please see “Abstract section: line 1-2, page 3” and “Conclusion section: line 5-7, page 16”.

Reviewer reports:

Bhiken Ishwarlal Naik (Reviewer 2): Thank you for addressing my concerns

Response: Thank you very much for your careful and thoughtful comments.

Daniela Ghisi, MD (Reviewer 3): All queries solved.

Response: Thank you very much for your careful and thoughtful comments.