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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

enclosed please find our revised manuscript "Intraluminal instillation of urokinase and autologous plasma: A method to unblock occluded central venous ports."

Referee No 1 Jeff Szer

1. The referee suggests to revise the language and style.

We revised the manuscript regarding the wording at full length.

2. We included a table demonstrating the patient characteristics.

3. We changed the mistakable part ("after several frustrane..."") describing our "routine procedure"

Methods section, line 2

Referee No 2

1. The referee suggests to add a description of our "routine procedure."

Methods section, line 2
"How many times had the procedure failed before the new technique was tried?"
Methods section, second sentence

"Were the successes simply the result of repeated efforts?"
Because of the chronological coincidence of the change in technique and the success it seems rather unlikely that the success was to accomplished by the number of efforts.

"Did the new technique ever fail?"
Results section, last two sentences

"Make clear that these were withdrawal occlusions, not…"
Methods section, line 2

I hope we revised the manuscript to the satisfaction of the editors

Yours sincerely

Georg Seifert

Dr. Anja Borgmann