The authors present a case of a patient with a nodule in upper lobe of the right lung. In preoperative assessment, an insufficiency of the mitral valve was diagnosed. The authors recommend simultaneous operative treatment of right lung and mitral valve. Usually they prefer open approach, but in this case, they describe first usage of totally robotic approach. I have few annotations:

Comment 1: The syntax and grammar of the whole manuscript is weak.
Reply 1: The whole manuscript was revised by a native-speaker.

Comment 2: You should verify the usage of the term “However”.
Reply 2: I used the term nevertheless (see page 3, line 50).

Comment 3: The introduction is unstructured. It seems as if several authors wrote some sentences and you just put them together. Probably you might show the advantages of a simultaneous management in contrast to disadvantage of two separate interventions.
Reply 3: I changed the whole text of the introduction (see page 3 and 4, lines 47-80).

Comment 4: Is the term “on the other hand” in line 34 the correct phrase?
Reply 4: I removed the term and changed the whole text in that section (see page 3, lines 62-68).

Comment 5: Reading of the whole text is uncomfortable because it seems to be one block without any paragraphs.
Reply 5: I revised the whole manuscript about this comment and added two new paragraphs (see page 4, line 83; see page 5, line 108).

Comment 6: “Bed” might be the wrong term. I suppose you used an “operating table”.
Reply 6: I changed the term bed with operating table (see page 4, line 85).

Comment 7: “Minithoracotomy” should be replaced by “utility incision”.
Reply 7: I changed the term minithoracotomy with utility incision (see page 4, line 91).
Comment 8: You change the tenses in the description of the surgical technique. First part is written in past tense, meanwhile you switch to present tense and afterwards you use past tense again.

Reply 8: I changed the tenses in the second part of the surgical technique (see pages 5 and 6, lines 109-130).