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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

Thank you for your message and suggestion to response to reviewers’s comment (Version 3, Dated 3 July 2013). I would like to mention the details of our response as the following

1. The conclusions state that there is a substantial reduction in PIH, but really since it is not statistically significant, it is really just a "trend" towards significance. I would state it this way.

Response; We have revised statement as “We found a statistically insignificant difference but with a trend towards significant reduction in the risk of PIH in patients allocated to TXA without evidence of increased risk of thrombotic adverse events. " in Discussion/principal finding at the first sentence. Also the statement about non statistical difference, has been mentioned again in Conclusion of the abstract and detail in manuscript too.

2. The article still needs fairly extensive editing for punctuation and grammar although it is improved.

Response; In fact, we have a native British English writer help us for writing this manuscript at first time. We have added more details according to the reviewers’ suggestion. However almost statements of the original draft are still being keep to date. So far we have already revised and reviewed the manuscript per suggestion again for this submission.

3. I would include the exclusion of coagulopathy as a limitation and also as a point of further research. I would also highlight the lack of thrombotic side effects more since that is a real positive conclusion of this well-defined study.
Response; The concern of excluding coagulopathy is mentioned in strength and weakness of the manuscript at the last paragraph already as “Finally the exclusion of coagulopathy is also a limitation of our study and this subject could be a point to explore in further research”. The finding about lacking of thrombotic adverse effect is stated in Discussion/ principal finding “We found a statistically insignificant difference but with a trend towards significant reduction in the risk of PIH in patients allocated to TXA without evidence of increased risk of thrombotic adverse events. “.

4. We have reviewed the manuscript following the BMC’s instruction in website. We use the template of the title page and revise the table/figure/reference in the manuscript to conform the BMC journal already.

We do hope this is a better written manuscript than the previous version according to the comment. We have submitted this revised manuscript online already. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best wishes,

Surakrant Yutthakasemsunt