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Author's response to reviews:

In Plzen, September the 26th, 2015

Dear Editor, dear reviewers,

Thank you for re-considering and reviewing our manuscript MS: 5239739181537007 - Fluid management guided by a novel continuous non-invasive arterial pressure device is associated with decreased postoperative morbidity in patients undergoing total knee and hip replacement and also for the opportunity to revise it. As only one referee added some more criticism to our work, we do thank you all for time spent by reviewing it. The response to the question raised as well as the revised manuscript please find attached. Regarding language editing, the manuscript was copy-edited by a native speaker and hopefully improved enough for further consideration.

We hope that our revised manuscript may be found suitable for publication in BMC Anesthesiology.

With regards,

Jan Benes
(on behalf of all the authors)

******************************************************************************

Referee 4:

Major revisions would be for the discussion, I think the authors try very hard to
explain their methods which does not have to be too long and the readers can search more details elsewhere. I think the authors should revise the redundant discussion, the two too long paragraphs on page 12 line 8 through page 14 line 15, to make it better.

Thank you for this concern about length and complexity of our methods section and discussion. We have really tried to make the methods section as simple as possible, but due to many raised criticism during the review process the methods section somehow “inflated”. Now we believe it contains all necessary information and some of those redundant were placed in supplements (i.e. complication definition etc.).

Regarding the discussion, the length of this part may be of debate, but we believe three pages are not “that redundant”. Actually many points mentioned in the discussion were added in response to previous referees comments. But we agree that some sentences were still overzealous and the length of the paragraphs would make them difficult to read. For this reason we have tried to revise the discussion not only by rephrasing or leaving several sentences (or their parts), but also by splitting it into more paragraphs.

With many thanks for your time and regards
Jan Benes