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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors have gone to extraordinary lengths to respond to the reviewers and they are to be congratulated on their diligence to address our concerns. I can well understand the desire to see their efforts appear in print, but I fear that they have been pre-empted by similar publications and an updated algorithm.

With respect to my previous comments, I had noted that the Mayer report had come to essentially the same conclusion as the current research - that the overall percentage error was unacceptably high. While I understand that the present study is looking at a slightly different patient population, it would seem to me that an unfavorable comparison in a homogeneous population that is hemodynamically stable (Mayer) is going to be just as unfavorable in a non-homogeneous population with hemodynamic instability, if not more so. Indeed I'd be shocked if it was not. I do not see that the present study is contributing anything new to the literature, and furthermore, the device is now operating with an updated algorithm, further dating the results of the study.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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