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Dear Editor:

Thank you very much for raising professional concerns and asking us to revise our subscription. After assessing a large amount of literature and obtaining recent experiments data, we provide a point-by-point response to each reviewer. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or find anywhere inappropriate. We will carry out further research and make corrections accordingly.

Thank you again and we are looking forward to being accepted by this journal.

Yours sincerely,

Hong Ma Ph. D

Email: mahong5466@yahoo.com
Address: No. 155 Nanjing North Street, Shenyang, Liaoning, China, 110001
Telephone number: +86 24 8328 3157
Facsimile number: +86 24 8328 2997
Replies to Reviewer 1 (Nuzhet Mert Senturk):

Major
-1. In my first review, I have asked for a figure showing the relative changes in each study. 
Now we have on figure regarding the shunt during OLV.. It is interesting that only two 
studies (except the "historical" one of Garutti) have resulted the difference against the TEA. 
I still do not think that a difference of 166.9 vs 171.2 mmHg can be clinically relevant; even if 
it is statistically significant.
I suggest to change the conclusion of the manuscript to "insufficient data". 
This is the only (but very major) critic that I still have...
Answer: Thank you for the question raised by reviewer. We've re-researched relative studies about 
one-lung ventilation and thoracic epidural anesthesia online in the past few months. Unfortunately, 
it still could not include any study for this meta-analysis. It's true that a difference of 166.9 vs 
171.2 mmHg can be clinically relevant even if it's statistically significant. But the main aim of the 
manuscript is just to alter the potentially pathophysiological changes and make some preventions 
in advance. So according to the suggestion of the reviewer, we've changed the conclusion of the 
manuscript to "insufficient data" in the abstract and also mentioned in the discussion section 
(colored blue, Page 12 line 2 and Page 13 line 22 ).

Replies to Reviewer 2 (Thomas Hachenberg):
The authors have sufficiently addressed the concerns raised by the reviewer. I am still 
confused about the title of the manuscript. Shouldn't it read "The effects of" ... Thoracic 
Epidural analgesia on Oxygenation and pulmonary Shunt Fraction during One-lung 
Ventilation: A meta-Analysis?
Answer: Thank you for such good revision of this title. We've changed the title of this study into 
"The effects of" ... Thoracic Epidural analgesia on Oxygenation and pulmonary Shunt Fraction 
during One-lung Ventilation: A meta-Analysis .

Replies to Reviewer 3 (Elena Bignami):
I appreciate your comments to the review.
After reading your new version of the manuscript, I think you need only a minor revision on 
written English.
Answer: Thank you for the reviewer's precious appreciation. We've revised on the written English 
with the help of MedSci CME.