Dear Prof. Scarlatescu,

We appreciate you and the reviewers very much for your kind remarks and comments, which are valuable and very helpful for improving our manuscript. We have addressed all comments you and reviewers raised, and revised our manuscript according to the comments. We would like to
express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for comments on our manuscript again. Our point-to-point responses to the comments are as follows:

Editor Comments:

Thank you for sending the revised version of the article. The manuscript is much improved now. I have only 2 minor suggestions:

- I would suggest to add in Table 2 the number of patients in each group (urosepsis, non-urosepsis)
- Please mention in the Methods if the p value considered significant is one-sided or two-sided

Response: Thank you very much. We have viewed the suggestions and made corresponding amendments in Table 2 and the Methods section in the revised version (see page 9, paragraph 1, line 9).

Reviewer comments:

Chin-Chen Chu, M.D., Ph.D. (Reviewer #2):

Thanks for the authors' detailed revision. All the queries have been clearly answered and the manuscript have improved very much after the corrections. Now, I have no more comment.

Response: We really appreciate the Dr. Chu’s previous valuable comments and suggestions for us to improve the manuscript. Thank you very much.

Aldo Espinosa (Reviewer #3):

I believe the data is still controversial drawn, but I agree it is a good discussion to be started through this article about a sepsis diagnosis while under anesthesia.

Response: Special thanks to you for your understanding and positive comments. We hope there will be more research to improve the concept in the future.