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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review a second revised version of this manuscript.

Point 1:

The authors have removed the sentence "Currently, there is no specific intervention that could be considered as an effective directly EG protecting strategy" from the text, which now allows this section to make logical sense. Their reply to this point, agreeing that there is no evidence that damage to the EG causes adverse patient outcomes, still does not accord with their introductory statement that remains in the text: "damage to the EG can contribute to clinical deterioration of the patient".

Point 2:

This point has now been satisfactorily addressed.

Point 4:

This point has now been satisfactorily addressed.

Point 6:

The point I am suggesting could be made is: "While there is extensive preclinical evidence for the ability of FFP in preserving the EG, suggesting a role beyond its current indication as a source of coagulation factors, this evidence is currently lacking for preparations of factor concentrates that are currently marketed and recommended as alternatives. There is currently insufficient clinical evidence upon which to recommend FFP over factor concentrates in this respect, but arguably there is both rationale and equipoise for a randomised controlled trial".

Point 7:
This point has now been satisfactorily addressed.

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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