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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Rowles,
Dear Sheila Riazi,
Dear Joseph R Tobin,
Dear Neil A Pollock,

enclosed to the revised manuscript we would like to reply to the specific questions and comments of the reviews and outline the corrections and modifications of the manuscript.

Again we would like to thank you for your valuable comments and would be glad if the revised manuscript would meet with your approval.

Sincerely,

Frank Schuster

Editorial comments:

- As highlighted by a number of the reviewers, we feel that your manuscript would benefit from some corrections being made to the style and grammar of written English.

An English teacher proofread the manuscript. We hope that the style of written English is now acceptable.

Reviewer: Sheila Riazi

Reviewer's report:
The corrections have been done.
There are no more recommendation

The authors would like to thank Sheila Riazi for reviewing the manuscript and for
her helpful comments and suggestions.

Reviewer: Joseph R Tobin

Reviewer's report:
The authors have extensively revised the manuscript. This manuscript is easier to follow.
In both the comments to reviewers, and in the introduction in the revised manuscript, the authors clarify the rationale for this manuscript.
The editorial office will need to review a number of small grammatical errors.
The discussion is revised well. The authors do not attempt to overstate their findings. They do make it more clear that the purpose of this report is to educate that newer anesthetic agents still pose a risk for triggering malignant hyperthermia.
The Tables presented are useful.

The authors would like to thank the Joseph R. Tobin for reviewing the manuscript and for his helpful comments and suggestions.

Reviewer: Neil A Pollock

Minor essential revisions
1. page 4 line 12.. if blood gas analysis was implemented
The phrase was changed as suggested by the reviewer.

2. Page 5 line 2. A number should not start a sentence. Similarly the beginning of the 3rd paragraph on page 5
Both sentences were re-written. For details, please see the highlighted changes in the revised manuscript.

3. the first 2 sentences in the second paragraph on page 5 are still a little confusing. Presumably the MHN group refers to the remaining 8/19 patients. This could be made clearer

Thank you for this helpful comment. The paragraph was re-written in the revised version of our manuscript

4. Page 5 2nd para, line 15... included...
Changed according to your suggestion.

5. Page 8, 1st paragraph, sugammadex is spelt incorrectly
Spelling was corrected.

6. Page 8, 2nd para, ..halothane or sevoflurane
Changed according to your suggestion.

7. Page 9, 2nd paragraph... since the presence of an acidosis. Also a reason for less evidence of metabolic acidosis may be earlier diagnosis

We changed the last sentence of the paragraph according to your suggestions.

8. Page 10, 2nd paragraph ....MH has been available....

Changed according to your suggestion.

We would like to thank Neil A Pollock for his profound comments, which helped to improve the quality of our manuscript