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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

1. Please mention if the semi invasive approach "TEE" had been performed before the general anesthesia or not. If not, all the hemodynamic parameters would be changed and reliability of the measurements would be decreased. Also the intracranial blood pressure would be increased, which would not be accepted.

2. In the methodology section, the way that is used to measure LVEDA is not clear. It is written in the abstract that LVEDVV was measured by TEE through the changes of LV short diameter of axle simultaneously but in the methodology section it is stated that LVEDA, LVEDV and LVEDVV was calculated from the formulas? This should be clarified. Besides the formulas that were used to calculate LVEDA, LVEDV actually are the formulas to calculate LVOT area and stroke volume! If the statistics were made by using these calculations it is so normal to find significance and correlation among two methods!! You should check those formulas!!

3. 69% of patients were hypertensive. There were no information about the hypertensive medication and intraoperative change in tension. This is also important for the stroke volume calculation.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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