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Reviewer's report:

I would like to congratulate the authors on their extensive work. Interesting manuscript in an area of controversy, despite increasing numbers of good quality trials.

General Aspects
1) Is the paper in scope for the journal and of interest to the readers of the journal?
Yes, the paper is definitely interesting for anesthesiologists and for the readers of the journal

2) Is the paper well written and easy to read?
The paper is well written and easy to read. A few minor details need to be addressed. See below

3) Is the methodology accurate and clearly presented?
Methodology is according to the PRISMA guidelines and clearly presented

4) If relevant, has the statistical analysis been carried out correctly?
Yes

5) Are the conclusions drawn from the data accurate? Do they address the main question?
Accurate conclusions are drawn, especially in this area of controversy

6) Are all the data, citations and references appropriate and clear?
Citations and references are appropriate and clear

Few minor aspects need to be addressed:
- Please write abbreviations in full, when they appear for the first time in the text. For example the abstract. Is much easier to understand
- At the end of the introduction you state that your review helps in the clinical decision making process regarding the choice of ventilation strategy by surgeons and anesthesiologists. Since when do surgeons need to make a decision about that?

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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