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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: It is an interesting and well-designed study. It appears to have been conducted rigorously. In my opinion it stands a good chance of being published in a cardiac surgery or cardiac anesthesia journal.

Some improvements could be made to the manuscript to increase the likelihood of acceptance; I will outline these below.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

There are two hypotheses: these should be explicitly stated in the last paragraph of the Introduction. This is not an issue in the Abstract.

You mention 'hypothermia', but not how you defined this: please include.

I got a bit confused with the term 'treatment group', particularly in the Abstract. I recommend changing this to 'pre-warming group' throughout, to avoid confusion with benzodiazepine treatment.

Table 1 would benefit from a column on the right with p values for each parameter.
Were the changes in core temperature really statistically significant to \( p < 0.001 \)? The error bars seem to overlap.

Also, the pre-warming data are not presented in a graph. Why not? It was one of your main hypotheses, yet you present the Ramsay Score, which was not.

There were more limitations than acknowledged: flunitrazepam was not administered by patient weight; it was a single center study; the sample size was small. Reviewers will expect these issues to be discussed.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The manuscript is well written but there are a few grammatical errors that would benefit from being corrected. Please ensure that the manuscript is given one final read-through by a native English speaker before submission.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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

Yes

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.

No
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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