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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

You have presented the results of a prospective randomized double blinded trial on the changes of static and dynamic hemodynamic parameters during general anesthesia with thoracic epidural anesthesia for major abdominal surgery.

The manuscript is written sufficiently, the length is acceptable and the statistical methods are mentioned and enough.

Please give your statement to the following points:

1. Abstract
   - Please better specify in the "conclusion" if "the high dose" or "High concentrations" of epidural ropivacaine…..

2. Introduction
   - Please specify the aim of the study and clinical message that the authors want to send

3. Materials and Methods

Please specify if they were followed the Consort guidelines

Inclusion/exclusion criteria: Well explained

Primary endpoint: well explained

Allocation/randomization: please, better specify

Sample size/power and calculation and statistical plan: well explained
   - Please better specify if there are missing data
4. Discussion
   - please specify the aim of the study and clinical message that the authors want to send

6. Tables
   - no problem

7. References

Please check the journal's guidelines

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

NA

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal