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Reviewer's report:

The point I made when I revised the manuscript first, that another retrospective study will not be helpful answering the study questions, is still valid.

The authors answered to my concerns about a possible allocation error by providing completely new data. They claim, that an allocation error cannot exist, as only four groups were involved in the study, of which 2 stuck to the first technique and the other two to the second. The answer is good and solves the problem. I simply wonder, why they didn't provide this important information in the original manuscript and very much hope, this data is valid.

Unfortunately, the authors didn't want to provide statistical power to their results as requested by me. That is sad, because it can easily be computed from the data provided in the manuscript. Concerning the postoperative pneumocrania, the effect size is 1.409 and the power is 1.0. Computing that took 2 minutes and strengthens the main result a lot.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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