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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is a compilation of observations from various publications between the year 2000 to 2019. It was intended to compare how the end results differ between the urinary or thoracic catheter patients and the patients without those drains (catheters) in the perioperative periods after minimally invasive (VATS) surgeries. I have following observations-

1. The abstract, text and conclusion is vague and very difficult to correlate in the context.

2. The published series in table 1 and table 2 are inconclusive and statistically not proven to be significant in terms of findings or results.

3. How the OT time is correlated with patients with and without urinary catheters (NUC/UC?).

4. The LOS is not very different (minor) between NUC and UC group in table 1.

5. Most of the procedures in the table 2 include wedge resection. In the text and discussion the focus is on lobectomies. These are two different spectrum and extent of surgeries in patients with major lung issues and can not be generalized.

6. Table 2 is inconclusive. How the NCT group patients are different or have any advantage?

7. Why authors in the studies mentioned in the table 1 and 2 had chest drains in majority of the patients after or during surgeries? This was a selection or necessity?

I found the manuscript, inconclusive, not supported by clear and enough evidence and looks not much adding to the existing knowledge on the subject. There is no continuity and lack of adequate information on explanation of tables, cause and effects and significance of this study. The language and grammar is also a weakness of this paper.
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