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Reviewer's report:

The authors made a great improvement on their manuscript. However, as a reviewer, I have some suggestions before this manuscript becomes acceptable.

The structure of this manuscript remain confusing for readers although it states a comparable results of TEA and PVB on pain management for posterolateral thoracotomy.

1. To write as an assay, the paragraph should not be fragmented.

The background: it is enough for one paragraph for TEA and another paragraph for PVB.

i. Page 4, line 24 and page 5 line 3 are ambiguous.

ii. Page 5, line 4: simply replaced by "although PVB was believed as effective on pain relief as TEA, there are limited evidence on postoperative analgesia for posterolateral thoracotomy. In this study, we goaled to compare the effectiveness between TEA and PVB by measuring numeric pain rating scale (NRS) and clinical quality index(CQI) during the first 3 postoperative days.

iii. Page 4 line 6-19, move it to the methods. Be concise.

The methods: the method should be started on the ethical permission. The inclusion criteria etc. page 7, line 23-25 should be placed here.

i. Table 1 should be moved to the results; it is the demographic data.

ii. Page 7, line 17-22, and page 8, line4-11 move to results, it were the surgical data following the demographic ones.

The results should be reorganized.

Table 1 demographic data of 2 groups of patients
Table 2 surgical data of 2 groups of patients

What is in the authors' table 2? A blood pressure (every 4 hours 1st day)? Were they systolic pressure or mean arterial pressure? I do not think it is acceptable.

Page 15 line 13-16, move it to methods.

Discussion

Please focus on your main finding. Do not elaborate too much and do not repeat statement of the results.
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