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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor,

1. The sentences should not begin with numbers; you have used it in the title and elsewhere in the text.

   The title sentence and first sentence of fifth paragraph in the materials and methods section were corrected as you have mentioned.

2. It was stated by the authors in the results and discussion that postoperative hospital length of stay and intensive care unit stay were shorter in HES group, but opposite was stated in conclusion. Probably there is a misstatement in conclusion, it should be corrected. Number of platelet concentrate used was lower in HES group, this should also be stated in conclusion.

   There was a misstatement as you mentioned in conclusion section. It was corrected as and the decreased ICU and hospital length of stay and decreased use of PC were emphasized.

3. In results section and table 2, you document that amount of drainage, RBC and FFP used were lower, but the number of cases who underwent re-exploraion for hemorrhage was higher in HES group. How do you explain this controversy?
The number of RBC concentrate (p:0.397) and FFP (p:0.877) used were lower in HES group, but the difference was not statistically significant. Likewise, the number of cases that underwent revision (p:0.445) was higher, but the difference was not statistically significant. So, actually there is no controversy regarding this subject.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:** No
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Version: 1

Date: 5 March 2013

Reviewer: tolga tatar

Reviewer's report: No major compulsory revisions are needed.

Minor essential revisions regarding spelling and grammar could be necessary.

The spelling errors and grammatical errors were corrected.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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Reviewer: SERDAR GUNAYDIN

Reviewer's report:

I have reviewed the manuscript entitled “6% hydroxyethyl starch 130/0.4 vs. a balanced crystalloid solution in cardiopulmonary bypass priming: A randomized, prospective study”.

This study compares 6% hydroxyethyl starch 130/0.4 vs. a balanced crystalloid solution in priming solutions during CPB within 200 patients.

Major points:
1. 6% hydroxyethyl starch 130/0.4 is a popular priming agent used open heart surgery with CPB. The patient population is relatively small to bring novel information.

   The study included 200 patients randomized into two groups. To bring novel information the sample size is not enough as you have mentioned and we also added this statement in the conclusion section. However, the number of patients is considerably high compared to many others in literature.

2. The study is well designed but unfortunately nothing significantly different could be documented.
On the facts about HES products, there is an infinite discussion and very controversial results are being published everyday. So we believe that our results are worth noting.

3. The study would be of more interest if more than two regimens were compared.

The study design was made on two regimens, but our group plans to expand it as you have suggested in future studies.

4. 6% hydroxyethyl starch 130/0.4 solution is previously studied for renal protection, anti-inflammatory and hematologic effects. We learn nothing different in this limited study.

On the facts about HES products, there is an infinite discussion and very controversial results are being published everyday. So we believe that our results are worth noting.

5. References are relatively old. There are 2013 publications about 6% hydroxyethyl starch 130/0.4.

There are recent publications on HES, but not much on the subject of HES use in CPB priming. New references were added.
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**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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