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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Ms. Minien,

Thank you for your request for further corrections to this manuscript. Our responses to the Senior Assistant Editor Comments are set out below. Please note that we have been asked by the Reviewers to format this paper as a Review, not a Technical Advance paper. Please advise what headings we should adopt. I cannot find “Review” in your list of manuscript types.

Yours sincerely

Philip Peyton

1. Please format the abstract according to our submission guidelines.
Response: Please see response to 2 below.

2. Please ensure the manuscript is structured as per our submission guidelines with the appropriate subheadings. For more information, please see: https://bmcanesthesiol.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/technical-advance-article
Response: Please note that we have been asked by the Reviewers to format this paper as a Review, not a Technical Advance paper. Please advise what headings we should adopt. I cannot find “Review” in your list of manuscript types.
3. Please provide a list of all the abbreviations used in the manuscript. This list should be placed just before the Declarations section. All abbreviations should still be defined in the text at first use.
Response: This has been done

4. Please move the Declarations to after the conclusions and abbreviations.
Response: This has been done

5. Please list each individual author and their contributions in the Authors’ Contributions section (e.g. Authors AB, CD, EF and GH participated in data acquisition, analysis, and interpretation)
Response: This has been done

6. Please include a clear statement on ethics approval and consent to participate in the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of the Declarations. This should include the full name of the ethics committee (and the institute to which it belongs to) that approved the study and the committee’s reference number if appropriate.
Response: Please note that this is a review paper of a number of previously published studies. Is this appropriate? Is an ethics statement required at all in this manuscript?

7. We note that you have not included an acknowledgements section. If you have no acknowledgements please put ‘Not Applicable’ in this section.
Response:

8. Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.
Response:

9. Figures should be provided as separate files, and each figure of a manuscript should be submitted as a single file. Figure files should contain only the image/graphic, as well as any associated keys/annotations. Please do not include title/legends within the figure files.
Response: This has been done and Figures uploaded as JPEG files.

10. Please note that multi-panel figures (those with parts a, b, c, d etc.) should be submitted as a single composite file that contains all parts of the figure.
Response: For simplicity, we have renamed Figs 6A and 6b as Figure 6 and Figure 7 respectively.
11. Please remove the watermark from equation 5.
Response: Equation 5 has been rewritten as text instead of as a pasted image.

12. Upon submitting your revised manuscript, please assign to the section 'Perioperative medicine and outcome'.
Response: Thank you. This has been done.