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Dear Editor James Edwards,

Firstly, we appreciate you and editorial members of BMC Anesthesiology for your valuable suggestions on our manuscript: BANE-D-19-00116: Electric vagal nerve stimulation inhibits inflammation and improves early postoperation cognitive dysfunction in aged rats. Based on your comments and suggestions, we have revised carefully this manuscript and listed point-to-point responses to the editor’s comments as follows:

Editor’s Comments

1. Authorship change form -- Unfortunately, we cannot accept your authorship change form in its current state. We need the author’s actual signature on an actual page. We can accept images/multiple sheets used to sign the ACF, but we can’t accept copy/pasted signatures. Please resubmit your authorship change form that all authors have signed and do not use copy/pasted signatures in this form.

Response: In accordance with you suggestion, the authorship change form is re-submitted with all author’s actual signature on the actual page.
2. Euthanasia -- Please clarify your euthanasia methods, including whether animals were anaesthetised and/or unconscious, injection dosages if applicable, methods used and rationale etc. Please try to be as detailed as possible.

Response: After finishing behavior tests, all animals were humanely euthanized using intraperitoneal injection of 3% sodium pentobarbital (50 mg/kg) and rapid decapitation. The process was as soon as possible to avoid interference on the results of experiment.

3. Randomisation -- Per ARRIVE guidelines, please provide full details of how animals were allocated to experimental groups. This includes details of how rats were randomised.

Response: The RAND function of Microsoft Office Excel was used to allocate randomly all animals into experimental groups. The details can be found easily on internet.

4. Ethics approval -- Please confirm in your response whether the "ethics committee of Sanbo Brain Hospital" has jurisdiction over experimental animal studies.

Response: Because Sanbo brain hospital is affiliated to Capital Medical University, we informed ethics committee of Sanbo brain hospital for animal care and use, and Capital Medical University at the same time. This study was approved by Sanbo brain hospital and Capital Medical University. Capital Medical University has jurisdiction over experimental animal study.

5. Authors' contributions -- Please include a statement in the Authors' contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

Response: The sentence of “All authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case” is included in the Author’s Contribution section.

6. Availability of data and materials -- As part of our editorial policies we strongly encourage all authors to deposit their sequencing data before publication. Please deposit the sequencing data generated in this study in a suitable public repository such as the NCBI SRA database. Once you have deposited your data, ensure you provide the information on deposition and how to access these data in the ‘Availability of Data and Materials’ section in Declarations, including the permanent link or the unique identifier associated to it.
Response: Because the sequencing data is very little in this article, we do not deposit it in the NCBI SRA. But all data of this article are available from the corresponding author. The email address of the corresponding author is B2008194@126.com. Meanwhile, we provide the detail information in the ‘Availability of Data and Materials’ section in Declarations.

7. Figures -- We note that figures 1 through 3 are currently missing from the file inventory. Please rectify this in your revised manuscript.

Response: The original submission was right. Maybe there were some mistakes by us. The missing figures were submitted again.

8. Additional files -- Please remove any files from your file inventory that you do not wish to be published alongside your manuscript.

Response: According with your suggestion, a clean manuscript is re-submitted.

9. Clean manuscript -- At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.

Response: This manuscript is checked and read again. A clean version is re-submitted this time.

We do not know whether this new revised manuscript will achieve the sufficient level for publication in BMC Anesthesiology. Should you require any further revision and information with your warm heart to inform us at your convenience, we shall be happy to do it. Thank you and looking forward to receiving an early favorable reply.

Sincerely,

Jun Xiong, MD

Huijjun Wang, MD
Yin Bao, MD

Yuliang Guo, MD

Yongxing Sun, MD

Department of Anaesthesiology, Sanbo Brain Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing, 100093. People's Republic of China.

Tel. 86-13521697866.
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