Author’s response to reviews

Title: Effects of continuous infusion of phenylephrine vs. norepinephrine on parturients and fetuses under LiDCOrapid monitoring: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study

Authors:

Kunpeng Feng (fengkunpeng@139.com)
Xiaohua Wang (15910851623@163.com)
Xuexin Feng (fengxuexin2008@139.com)
Jinfeng Zhang (babybei20052005@163.com)
Wei Xiao (kitten15@126.com)
Fengying Wang (wfy1204@hotmail.com)
Qi Zhou (lk602@sina.com)
Tianlong Wang (w_tl5595@hotmail.com)

Version: 2 Date: 24 Aug 2020

Author’s response to reviews:

BANE-D-20-00226R1
Effects of continuous infusion of phenylephrine vs. norepinephrine on parturients and fetuses under LiDCOrapid monitoring: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study
Kunpeng Feng; Xiaohua Wang; Xuexin Feng; Jinfeng Zhang; Wei Xiao; Fengying Wang; Qi Zhou; Tianlong Wang

Reviewer reports:
Reviewer 1:
(1) in abstract T4, T5, and T6 are still meaningless without reading the full paper.
Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. I revised this part, labled the T4, T5, T6 means in this part. (For easily tract the revision, we underline all revised parts in the text)

(2)Introduction is still lengthy without any improvement;
Reply: Thank you very much for your suggestion. I deleted some unnecessary sentence in BACKGROUND part, reduce the character number from 387 to 320. The Background part is more clear right now. Thanks again to the reviewer for his carefulness.

(3)The earlier mentioned statements such as ‘the placental perfusion reduction affects…’ have remained uncorrected.
Reply: Thank you very much for your suggestion. In background part “SA can negatively affect the parturient or the fetus by reducing the placental perfusion.” In discussion part “a positive correlation has been suggested between the maternal CO and the uteroplacental blood flow in a previous study.” “A low CO may adversely affect uteroplacental perfusion and oxygen delivery to the fetus.” “The physiologic principal due to the SVR increase in phenylephrine relatively compensate the HR decrease, then maintain the CO level.” That mean the 0.25 phenylephrine increase parturients SVR, then maintain the CO level. We can test the phenylephrine effect on maternal SVR and maternal CO, but the effect on placental perfusion was needed further research in the future.
To avoid the misunderstanding of the reader, we deleted some sentence, make it more clear and easily understand right now.

(4) Results section is still confusing with several duplications.
Reply: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We were rewrited the result part and remove the duplication sentence. In result, the first-three paragraphs of “Hemodynamic parameters” were intra-groups comparison. The last paragraph of “Hemodynamic parameters part” were inter-group comparison. We check the “Blood gas indices” and “Comparison of adverse reactions among the three groups” part carefully, there were no duplications in these part right now.

Reviewer 2: GENERAL COMMENTS: I 'agree' on the content, but not yet on the somewhat overinterpretation of this dataset. Secondly, and as important, further editing is needed either by the authors, or by an external advisor, as the reading can be improved. I have tried to provide suggestions and comments on this in the detail section

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Abstract
Is still read the results of the abstract suboptimal as T4 to T6 are not defined. I still recommend the authors to adapt this. The same comment relates to the next but last sentence; Based on the currently available literature, it is better to state. "In this dataset, continuous phenylephrine infusions…. (and ameliorate should read ameliorated)
In-term: what do the authors mean with this ? full term ? (or simply 'term')
Results: maintain stable: rephrase to 'remained' or 'was maintained'
'Parturient', should read Parturients ?
Reply: Thanks a lot for your suggestion.
We adapt each point one by one, and highlight the revised part with yellow color.

Introduction
SA has taken priority
The new sentence added: 'the phenylephrine using' (perhaps: The choice for phenylephrine) has the benefit for parturients= but if you truly belief that this is the case, why still conduct the study? Suggest to make this less affirmative like:
The choice for phenylephrine has been reported to be more beneficial for parturients.
Reply: Thank you very much for your good suggestion. The sentence that you suggested is really the best. And I will very carefully in the future research and writing.
Methods
The dose of each medicine... : this is still not sufficiently clear in my assessment, despite the additional reference. Please explain.
Reply: Thanks a lot for your question, acturely, at the design period of the research, we refer many article to decided the final concentration of our study. But because the limitation of number of reference, we cannot reflect all of them to the reader. If you or other reader interesting for this, we will provide all the reference.
Thanks again for your attention.

Results
There is still overlap between the figures and the values reported in the text. Please avoid this, although this is an editing comment, and not a content related comment.
Reply: Thank you very much for your good suggestion. The accurate value cannot reflected in the figure, so for reflect the value for the reader, I report the some important values in the text. I rewrite this part, deleted the overlap value.

In the section on comparison of adverse reactions: 3rd line, administering prophylactic norepinephrine and phenylephrine = and should be changed to 'or'
The sentence on Bonferroni adjustment is perhaps better in the methods section?
Reply: Thank you very much for your good suggestion. I revised this part. Thanks again to the reviewer for his carefulness.