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Reviewer's report:

The changes made to the manuscript have significantly improved it.

I have a few minor comments:

1) Page 20 line 41: Be careful using "autopleurodesis" when referring to talc - clearly this is no longer "auto". I should suggest that in the few patients who had talc - it was effective in causing pleurodesis in line with other published studies (AMPLE, ASAP, TIME1, IPC-PLUS).

2) Page 21, line 54: I disagree with the statement that intrapleural fibrinolytics are an efficacious option [41]. This study was a retrospective study of pleural fluid output and sonographic appearance, which has fundamental selection bias. Please see this recent RCT of fibrinolytics vs placebo:

It showed no difference between the two arms

3) In the concluding paragraph, rewrite "IPC are highly efficacious in symptom relief" - your study has not looked at symptom control. The only head-to-head studies have shown IPC to be as efficacious as chest drain and talc for symptoms. Also what does "infectious mechanical" mean?. I suggest removing this and just stating "complications (including infection)".
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