Author's response to reviews

Title: The Hemobag: the modern ultrafiltration system for patients undergoing cardiopulmonary bypass

Authors:

Andrea Colli (colli.andrea.bcn@gmail.com)
Sara Balduzzi (sara.balduzzi@unimo.it)
Xavier Ruyra (xruyra.germanstrias@gencat.cat)

Version: 3 Date: 27 February 2012

Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor, thank you for asking to review our manuscript.

To reviewer 1:

Major revisions

1. Changed as suggested
2. Corrected in accordance with citation index

Minor revisions

1. Added as suggested
2. Introduced citation (6)
3. Citation introduced
4. Modified removing “recent"
5. Methods section modified clarifying that patients were consecutive patients treated according with surgeon preference.
6. Technology section reduced according to suggestion reducing the length.

To reviewer 2:

Major revisions

1. We did not compare the Hemobag to the MUF. So it is not correct to talk extensively about MUF.
2. Cell saver modified in Cell Washer as suggested
3. Results, stated that the data of HB, HCT, Albumin and fibrinogen were of the pre and post processing transfusion bags.
4. Table 3 clarified with “laboratory parameters of the transfusion bags before and after hemoconcentration”.
5. Grammar check used.

Minor revisions

1. Introduction reduced
2. Technology section reduced
To reviewer 3:

Minor revisions

1. Canceled US
2. I do not see redundancy.
3. Changed as suggested
4. Methods section rewritten. Clarified division in groups
5. Allocated changed
6. The surgeon did not use CW in the H group because we did not want to spend extra money for the CW circuit if not needed.
7. CE modified in EC (European community)
8. “novel” removed
9. Technology section shorter avoiding the terms: safely, quickly, more rapid...
10. Results: modified first sentence
11. Explained that Hb, Hct Albumin and fibrinogen were analyzed on the transfusion bags before and after hemoconcentration
12. Disavantages of direct infusion were stated in the introduction, basically hemodilution.
13. The methodology of our study is similar to Samolyk’s study because we have tested the blood in the transfusion bags before and after hemoconcentration with the 2 methods. We had less parameters. We used this methodology because we wanted to evaluate really the benefit of the hemobag on the residual post-CPB blood compared to the CW that was our standard of care method.
14. Final product refers to hemoconcentrated blood and not patients
15. We have canceled the best possible.
16. We have canceled “quick and fast”

Major revisions

We consider all the suggestions and we have rewritten the majority part of the manuscript that could lead the reader to see our paper as an advertising manuscript. We have no financial interest with the company. We report our experience that shows that the Hemobag hemoconcentrate well the blood and its use is safe (no adverse events related to the product were observed) and produce an higher quality “proceesed” blood respect to the centrifugated blood of the CW.
We have explained in the manuscript that hemobag present a major limitation that is more time consuming than the CW, due to the fact that the blood could not be pushed faster to prevent hemolysis.

We have also stated the limitation of the design of the study, not randomized and small number of patients.