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Author’s response to reviews:
Dear Editor Abola,

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript again, and we also appreciate you very much for your constructive suggestions on our manuscript entitled “A comparison of a loading dose of Dexmedetomidine combined with Propofol or Sevoflurane for hemodynamic changes during anesthesia maintenance: a prospective, randomized, double-blind, controlled clinical trial" (BANE-D-17-00263).

We have studied your comments very carefully and have made revision which marked in red in the paper. According to your kind suggestion, we add more explanation in the discussion
paragraphs, and also make some changes in the Abstract paragraphs. Attached please find the revised version, which we would like to submit for your kind consideration.

We would like to express our great appreciation to you for comments on our paper again. It deeply helps us enrich the content of the article. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Yueying Zhang, M.D.
Corresponding author
E-mail: zhangyy201009@163.com

Responses:

1. Please explain further in your discussion why it is unlikely that the different lengths of surgery/anesthesia time contributed to your findings.

Responses: We added the further explanations about this point, please see page 14, line 21-30 and page 15, line 15 1-2.

2. Please explain further in your discussion as to why you chose to load Dex toward the end of the case.

Responses: We added the further explanations about this point, please see page 15, line 5-11; page 12 4-20.
3. Other suggested revisions.

Since hypertension with DEX and propofol is an unexpected finding (or contrary to published literature), I would re-order your conclusion to highlight this in your Abstract - Consider: Conclusions: Intraoperative administration of a loading dose of dexmedetomidine combined with propofol in anesthesia maintenance proceeded a significant increase in blood pressure. Dexmedetomidine combined with propofol or sevofurane decreased heart rate. The second sentence about bradycardia is not unexpected due to the known side effects of DEX.

Responses: Thanks so much for your kind suggestions. According to your suggestion we reorganized the conclusion paragraphs in the abstract, please see page 2, line 2-5, 23-29.

4. Table 1 - Baseline DBP is listed twice - I believe the second one should be MAP (?) - Also the P + DEX group @ T0 had a lower blood pressure value than the other 3 groups. Although this is not statistically significant difference - a comment about whether this is relevant to your findings should be added to the discussion (MAP of P + DEX is 78, where as the other 3 groups - the MAP is 86, 73, 88).

Responses: We are so sorry for the mistakes, it should be MBP. We corrected it in the article. Thanks so much for your kind suggestions. According to your suggestion, secondly, we notice the difference between the groups, and it should be discussed further. Thus, we added the possible explanations in the article. Please find the explanations in page 14, line 7-15.

5. Discussion - Line 6 - I am unsure what you mean by "clinics"

Responses: we rewrote this paragraph and delete the “clinics”.