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Reviewer's report:

"PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

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 ?

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.

Methods
The dose of each medicine… : this is still not sufficiently clear in my assessment, despite the additional reference. Please explain.

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.

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 ?
ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
cf higher mentioned"
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Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question (including the use of appropriate controls), and are the conclusions supported by the evidence presented?

No
Are the methods sufficiently described to allow the study to be repeated?

Yes

Is the use of statistics and treatment of uncertainties appropriate?

Yes

Is the presentation of the work clear?

Yes

Are the images in this manuscript (including electrophoretic gels and blots) free from apparent manipulation?

Yes