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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Table 1 (demographic data) requires additional clarifying informations.

2. In the methods section, there are a lot of general informations about various methods to evaluate the intensity of main which should be moved into the discussions section or simply omitted.

3. Figures 1-4 (details about hemodynamic and SpO2 values) are difficult to follow and some information is redundant. I suggest a more simple way to present the data.

4. Table 3 needs more informations. What do these values represent? Mean, Median values? I also suggest to include the ranges for duration of the procedure, hospitalisation and drainage time.

5. Table 5 is also unclear.

6. When analysing the use of additional painkillers, you mention only the proportion of the patients in which they were used. Was the required dosage identical?

7. I think a strong limitation of the study is the great heterogenicity of the patients in terms of indications for surgery and type of the procedure. For example, group A included 3 pts with mesothelioma which is associated with greater pain due to the need to perform a pleurectomy.
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