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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Performing fibrobronchoscopy safely is quite important in daily clinical practice and examination. The present study might provide useful information concerning this area. However, there are several serious problems which should be clarified. (1) Did all patients receive any sedative agent during bronchoscopy? (2) How long was bronchoscopy performed? (3) Total amount of lidocaine used is not clear in both groups. Increase in lidocaine plasma concentration may increase sedative effects as well as decrease airway discomfort (Br J Anaesth. 2020, 124: 314-323). It is quite important to demonstrate lidocaine plasma concentrations are same in both groups for comparison of usefulness. Both total amount of lidocaine used and plasma concentration of lidocaine should be shown and statistically analyzed in both groups.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Important study; but there are some limitations. First, it is a bit strange that in the case group, almost no alterations in some of the indices that we would expect to naturally change during anesthesia and bronchoscopy in the case group, most important of them the SpO2. So, I advice to double check the accuracy of the data. Secondly and even more important than that, the adverse events as summarized in table 3 are apparently more prevalent in the case group than the controls. So it argues against the new approach. Lastly, wasn't there any report of potential traumatizing through the procedure?