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Reviewer's report:

The authors report on their meta-analysis on the perioperative use of ACE-I. Some issues should be addressed:

- The manuscript should be revised by a native Speaker

- Why was Hypotension Chosen as main endpoint rather than handed endpoints (those defined as secondary)

- Define and justify sub studies in methods; why was not a subgroup analysis of RCT vs observational design conducted? There was a relevant heterogeneity how in the subgroup analyses;

- There was a significant heterogeneity also in the subgroup analyses; alternative subgroups to explain this?

- Cardiac surgery is a quite different Setting compared to noncardiac surgery, it should be justified why the authors decided to pool both types of surgery

- How did you take into account confounders for the results in observational studies

- Please assess and report formally Quality of evidence

- Half of the available publications (12/24) was excluded based on "endpoint conflict and no available data"; please expand on this, further please state if you contacted the others of the publications were data were not available

- Please check the correctness of line 167 ("the difference remained significant..."

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

No
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
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