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Dear Editor,

We appreciate the thorough review of our manuscript and helpful comments provided by the reviewers. We tried to address all the issues raised in the extensive review. Below you will find a copy of each of the reviewers’ comments, along with a point-by-point response in bold font:

**Reviewers Comments:**

Reviewer 1#: Yalim Dikmen

Reviewer's report:

This is a review on how to perform fluid therapy in the preoperative setting. It is a nice summary of the studies on liberal versus restrictive fluid strategies. Also giving some consideration on goal directed therapy. Perhaps the authors would review the hemodynamic goals again to add the evidence on the use of esophageal doppler, plethysmographic waveform analysis as the goals along with the pulse contour analysis. Also the use of perioperative lactate levels may be another consideration. The addition of these arguments may give the reader other options in hemodynamic manipulations. Another point is that in major surgery, another treatment option may be aiming supra normal oxygen delivery. Although the authors mentioned this in the manuscript briefly, this may be an interesting subject to be written in more detail.

I think this report is a nice effort to summarize available evidence.

Thank you for the suggestion to integrate the paper with the GTD approach. We have integrated the article with the following subheading, in the Discussion section: “The third fluid administration strategy in the perioperative setting: Goal-directed therapy”. We hope that all your interesting hints have been addressed.

Reviewer 2#: Guniz Meyanci Koksal

Reviewer's report:
The manuscript must include abstract, introduction, material-methods, results, discussion and conclusion sections. I did not see material-method and results section. Is this manuscript review or trial? I don’t understand.

It is a debate article. We now have formatted the text following the guidelines as per your direction.

In closing, we hope that our revised manuscript addresses all the issues raised in the review. We would be pleased to make further changes upon request. On behalf of the other authors, I extend my gratitude for your time and assistance and we look forward to hearing your response.

Kind regards,

_Luigi Vetrugno, MD_