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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for the opportunity to review this meta-analysis on the topic of uniportal vs multiportal VATS. My comments follow.

Abstract/Introduction
- You mention uniportal as a recent development yet state it has been around for approaching 20 years?

Method/Search
- I have repeated your search and have identified a couple of studies from December 2019 and wonder if there will be value from including these?
  o https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32030232

Recent meta-analyses on the topic not referenced

Tables
- There are some alignment issues in table 1 and 2 (e.g. table 1 between lobe and seg columns)

Figures
- Forrest plots are low resolution but I guess that may be the pdf conversion.

Discussion
- You find no differences, but I note that there are some that approach significance e.g. pain. There are some differences in this meta-analysis to others published with several seeming to favour uniportal. I wonder if the discussion could be expanded specifically explaining why you think that there are these differences. Why is there so much heterogeneity between studies - looking at the titles of some of the included studies, it would appear that the learning curve for uniportal is included and perhaps that may be contributory? Are there other reasons? As a reader I want to understand why several meta-analyses have favoured uniportal but yours does not…
There are some grammatical errors throughout and there may be benefit from seeking a native English speaker reviewing the manuscript.
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