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Reviewer's report:

kind Authors I went through your manuscript and I have to raise the following points:

- I would suggest to modify the authors list since most of the authors belong to the same institution and just to different departments. Try to use the superscript to refer to the different dept. within the same hospital, otherwise most of the informations are redundant.

- line 89, 91,95 XXX is modified by the editorial office or is as well omitted in the submitted version? If so it must be updated with the hospital name.

- You selected adult young patients, not elderly and selected asa I-II. Do you think it can represent an important bias of your investigation since most of the problems during prolonged high pressure Valsalva manoeuvre can be observed in elderly patients with pulmonary and cardiac comorbidity? Is somehow recommendable to tailor the peak pressure according to age and comorbidity?

- in my institutional experience we adopt 40 cm H2O for about 10 seconds and quite often it represents the limit of tolerability. In your experience longer time are applied and either they are longer with increasing pressure. Can you better explain this observation since theoretically the higher the pressure the faster the occult bleeding is highlighted.

- Line 128 " and the size of the bleeding vein (&lt;2 mm or &gt;2 mm) were recorded" Did you effectively measured the vessel or it was a general evaluation of small vs larger vessels?

Kind regards
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