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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

Thank you very much for your letter and advice. We have revised the paper, and would like to re-submit it for your consideration. We have addressed the comments raised by the reviewers, and the amendments are highlighted in red in the revised manuscript. We hope that the revision is acceptable, and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Dunyi Qi

We would like to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers for the constructive and positive comments.

Replies to Carla Todaro (Reviewer 2):

Thank you for your meticulous 3-point revision. We have revised the article according to your opinion (marked red part).
We are sorry for our lack of English proficiency, and the article has been sent to AJE for retouching in December 2018. However, due to insufficient funds, the grammar modification in the Revision phase was carried out by ourselves. If you still have doubts about the meaning of some sentences in the text, I hope you don't hesitate to tell us that we will make changes in the first time to make the article better published.

Page 2

In the end we used the following statement: The results of subgroup of patients without undergoing surgery (AUC =0.86, Youden index =0.65) and the results of subgroup of patients in ICU (AUC =0.89, Youden index =0.67) were reliable.

Page 3

We have modified the error that PI does not use abbreviations.

Page 4

We added " There seems to be no consensus on the reliability of PVI for different patients. " to make the article ideas smoother.

Page 4

We have revised the description of the inclusion of the literature to make the quality of written English higher.

Replies to Massimo Meco (Reviewer 3)

Thank you for your meticulous 6-point revision. We have revised it one by one according to your opinion (marked red part).

1) We focus our discussion on heterogeneity issues in the Results section (Page 9).

2) We are sorry for our lack of English proficiency, and the article has been sent to AJE for retouching in December 2018. However, due to insufficient funds, the grammar modification in the Revision phase was carried out by ourselves. If you still have doubts about the meaning of some sentences in the text, I hope you don't hesitate to tell us that we will make changes in the first time to make the article better published.

3) and 4) We changed the evaluation of heterogeneity so that readers can be more cautious about the results of meta-analysis( Page 10).

5) We changed the evaluation of cut-off values in the discussion, and suggested that readers refer to the cut-off values of different articles for different patients( Page 12).
6) We have removed the conclusions about the PVI accuracy of patients undergoing cardiac surgery (Page 2 and Page 14).

Replies to Issam Tanoubi, M.D., M.A.(Ed), D.E.S.A.R. (Reviewer 5)

Thank you for your thoughtful comments. We have revised it one by one according to your opinion (marked red part)

Page 3, first paragraph: "During the perioperative period, a noninvasive continuous automatic monitoring instrument is more comfortable to the patient than invasive monitoring". I suggest deleting this sentence.

Reply: Yes, we delete this sentence.

Page 3, line 17: « adds an module for monitor", replace an with a.

Reply: Yes, wo do.

Page 4, line 43 "If the full text of the article is not published in English, it will be excluded". I suggest rewording "We excluded articles that were not published in English".

Reply: We modified the expression of the sentence.

Page 5, line 1 "We also excluded review, case report, how, experiments on animals, or in vitro studies. ". I suggest using the plural form "We also excluded articles, case reports, comments ...

Reply: We modified the expression of the sentence.

Page 6, line 1: Please replace "graphics synthesis is done by Stata" with "graphics synthesis was performed by Stata".

Reply: Yes, wo do.

Replies to Alberto Fogagnolo (Reviewer 6)

Thank you for your thoughtful comments. We have revised it.
In the end we used the following statement: The results of subgroup of patients without undergoing surgery (AUC =0.86, Youden index =0.65) and the results of subgroup of patients in ICU (AUC =0.89, Youden index =0.67) were reliable.

If you still have doubts about the meaning of some sentences in the text, I hope you don't hesitate to tell us that we will make changes in the first time to make the article better published.