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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have put a lot of work into presenting a comprehensive revision of the manuscript. I believe the report has improved substantially, and I hope the authors feel the same way. However, two points I already criticized in the original submission have not been commented to my satisfaction or are even more misleading now, and I would invite the authors to revise them:

- According to the reviewers' suggestion, you modified the tables, and time points are now marked with minutes after starting the infusion of E. coli or saline. However, the caption of Table 1 and 2 still mentions 'T1' and 'T2', which in fact cannot be found in the table. Moreover, 'T60' is now given as '60 minutes after starting the saline infusion', but in the original submission, this was 'T2', the time point when saline infusion was actually started. This must be wrong, please correct.

- You still do not explain if baseline parameters differed significantly between control and sepsis group (e.g., SVRI (4084 vs. 2658) and SVV (15 vs. 10)), which has implications for the interpretation of the results. In addition to your two tables, please provide a third one, comparing baseline values of control and intervention group together with p-values.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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