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Reviewer’s report:

I have several concerns with this submission. First and foremost, significant improvements in the written English are needed throughout the entire manuscript. The impact of many sentences are lost due to inaccuracies in the translation. A significant review of the translation and rewrite would strengthen this manuscript tremendously.

Second, I'm not sure the conclusions the authors drew can be entirely contributed to the intervention. Volatile anesthetics have been shown to afford similar preconditioning effects. The authors mention that sevoflurane was used "as needed" during line placement. Likewise, the use of propofol may attenuate preconditioning effects. The use of volatile anesthetics should have been standardized as a part of the study protocol; ideally avoiding their use entirely. Since this was not done, the use of sevoflurane should be listed in Table 2. I'd also like to see the intraoperative use of inotropes in this table. Presumably all transplant patients received inotropes post bypass, but it would be interesting to see if there is a statistically significant difference in dose or number of inotropes required. If the intervention had a significant effect on myocardial protection, the intervention group may have a lower inotrope requirement.

Third, there is no p-value listed in Table 1 and there are clearly statistically significant differences between the groups. Most notably the preoperative use of inotropes was significantly higher in the control group. One could argue that this could increase myocardial work, oxygen consumption, and potentially myocardial damage (despite the fact that troponin was measured in the transplanted heart 6 hours post op). I would include p-values in this table and address any significant differences that are found.

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?
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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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