

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-23-158>

Reviewer A

I would like to congratulate the authors on a well written manuscript.

In this retrospective study, the authors investigated the effect of pressure controlled ventilation with end inspiratory flow rate during PCNL in prone position. The retrospectively compared fixed respiration ration PCV to target controlled PCV.

Abstract:

The abstract is well written.

In line 43 I believe you mistakenly wrote perioperative complication, when you probably meant postoperative complications.

Reply 1: We thanks for your comments. We have revised the mistake. See page 2, line 43.

Introduction:

Well written and referenced.

Reply 2: We thanks for your comments.

Methods:

Well written.

Reply 3: We thanks for your comments.

Results:

You noted that in the fixed respiratory PCV group, the incidence of pulmonary complication was significantly reduced. But, in table 2 all the pulmonary complications noted were found to be non-significant. You did state that the overall incidence of complications was significantly lower, but were these complications?

Reply 4.1: We mean the overall incidence of PPC. We thanks for your suggestion.

You noted that the peak airway pressure and airway platform pressure in the target controlled PCV group was significantly reduced. What is the clinical significance of this finding?

The authors also noted decreased levels of IL-6 and CRP in the fixed respiration PCV group. What is the clinical significance of this? Are you able to prove the elevated

levels of IL-6 and CRP were associated with an elevated incidence of pulmonary complications?

Reply 4.2 We have revised the discussion and discussed both the tissues in the discussion. We thank for your comments. See page 8, line 222-231.

Discussion:

Well written.

I think you should try to reference studies looking into PCNL pulmonary complications associated with ventilation. Is your study this first looking into the issue?

Reply 5: We found no studies looking into PCNL pulmonary complications associated with ventilation. We have added in the discussion. See page 8, line 239-240.

Conclusions:

The authors noted decreased incidence of post-operative complications, but what were these complications?

Reply 6: We have revised. See page 8, line 239-240.

Reviewer B

General comments

The grammar and the wording need to be corrected. There are many mistakes throughout the manuscript, especially in the first half. The authors should consider consulting an English native speaker to help them with the syntax and grammar.

Reply 1: We thanks for your comments. We have revised the manuscript accordingly.

Title

The title of the manuscript is too long. It would be better if it would be more concise. Be careful with grammar.

Reply: We have shortened the title. Page 1, line 2-3.

Abstract

The abstract is consice, involving all the necessary information about the study. **The first sentence in “Methods” section needs grammar corrections.**

Reply: We have revised the sentence. See page 2, line 36-38.

Introduction

- The overall quality of the Introduction is good. The aim of the study is clearly stated.

Reply: We thanks for your comments.

Methods and Results

- These sections are presented in an extensive way
- The tables and figures are really helpful and necessary for the completion of the authors work.

Reply: We thanks for your comments.

Discussion

- The discussion is of good quality and analyzes the results of the study
- The authors inform the reader about the study limitations.

Reply: We thanks for your comments.

Conclusion

- From the presented data, the conclusion is complete and represents the work that the authors did.

Reply: We thanks for your comments.