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Reviewer's report:

In my last I review, I stated that:
In my opinion, the paper should not be published with the analysis that is illustrated in fig 1 and commented on throughout the paper. This is because it is scientifically unsound, as previously explained. I acknowledge that the vast majority of previous publications in this field have presented an equivalent analysis. However, this error should not be perpetuated further.

My comments stand for the next version of the paper. I think that the plots of PulseCO and LiDCO against time are helpful (but could be improved by having identical y-axes for each subplot).

There are 3 alternatives:
1) The paper is rejected as it is still scientifically unsound.
2) The analysis in Fig 1. is removed from the paper entirely.
3) The paper is accepted by the editor despite my recommendations.

I will not review any further drafts unless the second option is pursued.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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As for previous reviews.