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Reviewer's report:

This is a retrospective cross-sectional study to identify the associated factors of prolonged length of stay (LOS) regarding the hepatobiliary (HPB) and neurosurgery (NS). The variables should be over-comprehensive and some are not well-justified. The background and discussion is too brief and superficial. However, the findings is important to inform the health care policy and operation plan. I hope to read a revised manuscript.

Background:

P3. line 20-23, The reason of choosing the elective procedure for this study is not sound enough. Some reasons may be related to the representativeness or sample variance (like limited some confounding factors).

P4, line 9-11. It is strange to state the ethical consideration in the section of "background".

The entire background is too brief.

Measures:

P6, line 55. Operational definitions for all explanatory variables are important, which provides a communication with the literature (e.g., BMI cutoff). Sometimes, it may affect the findings as well. The authors attached the supplemental 1 and 2. which gives better understanding on the selected variables. Nevertheless, there are still some unclear, e.g., nutrition score, number of
delays, and so on. Some variables are difficult to understand how it is related to LOS, e.g., operation end after 5pm, discharge after 5pm, when is the admissions. I believe that all variables should be well-justified and the researchers shall not fish the significant results by putting all variables for trials.

P.8, line 4-19. The justification of discriminant analysis needs reference for support.

Discussion and conclusion:
The authors comprehensively analyze all associated factors predicting the prolonged LOS. The results deserve a lot of discussion to justify and communicate with the literature. However, the discussion is too short and superficial.

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 recommend additional statistical review
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

Do you want to get recognition for reviewing this manuscript? Add a record of this review to Publons to track and showcase your reviewing expertise across the world's journals. Signing up is quick, easy and free!

Yes