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Dear Editor,
Thank you and all the reviewers very much for the comments. We have carefully revised the manuscript critically according to the reviewers’ comments and style checklist in all our efforts, making sure there is no typographical, grammatical, and bibliographical error. All the changes made in the revised paper are highlighted with red color so that these changes can be easily found. Here below is the detailed description on revision according to the comments.

**Comments of Referee 1**

Comment 1: Minor Essential Revisions.
Because the listed complications maybe relate cardiopulmonary bypass but not definitely, so I recommend that the title is ‘Postoperative Abdominal Complications after Cardiopulmonary Bypass’.
Response: According to the referee’s suggestion, the title has been changed to ‘Postoperative Abdominal Complications After Cardiopulmonary Bypass’.

Comment 2: Discretionary Revisions
If the name of brief operation - add another table - were described, I could have know the total patient population.
Response: We have added a table to describe the characteristic of total patient population in the revised paper.

Comment 3: I confused the term ‘gastrointestinal complication’ and ‘abdominal complication’. If the meanings are similar, how about use same term in title of table?
Response: The meanings of ‘gastrointestinal complication’ and ‘abdominal complication’ are similar indeed. We used a unified term ‘abdominal complication’ throughout the revised paper to avoid possible confusing.

Comment 4: In Table 2, the sum of patients (positive and negative history of peptic ulcer) was different other title, not 2349.
Response: Thanks very much for the referee’s so detailed and elaborative review. This was a type error, and we are deeply sorry for our carelessness. We have revised the number in the term as it should be.

Comment 5: If the number used at first word of sentence, not use ‘4 of 9 (44.4%) patients.......’
Response: We have revised the paper to meet the standard style.

Comment 6: Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Response: We have invited a colleague proficient in English to edit the language before resubmission.
**Comment of Referee 2**

Comment: The authors report their retrospective experience on a very present issue which is postoperative abdominal complications associated with cardiopulmonary bypass. Methodology and clinical results are clearly reported. Discussion and conclusions are well balanced.

Response: We greatly appreciate the referee’s positive and affirmative comment.