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Author’s response to reviews:

January 22nd, 2020

Editorial Department of BMC Anesthesiology

Dear Editors,

Please consider our revised manuscript, entitled “Effects of Low Versus Standard Pressure Pneumoperitoneum on Renal Syndecan-1 Shedding and VEGF Receptor-2 Expression in Living-donor Nephrectomy: A Randomized Controlled Study” for publication in BMC Anesthesiology. We appreciate the interest that the editors and reviewer have taken in our manuscript and the constructive reviews they have given to improve our manuscript. We have addressed the concerns of the reviewer. We have also included a point-by-point response to the reviewer in addition to the changes described in the manuscript.

Thank you again for consideration of our revised manuscript.

Yours Sincerely,
Dita Aditianingsih, MD, PhD
Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care,
Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Indonesia,
Jakarta, Indonesia
Email ditaaditiaa@gmail.com

POINTS OF REVISION:
Assistant Editor Comments:

1. Reviewer Comments
-- Please see the reviewer comments at the end of this email.
Response:
Thank you, we have reviewed and made revisions accordingly.

2. Authorship Change
-- We note the addition of a new author, [Suhendro Suwarto], since the original submission of the manuscript.

In line with COPE guidelines, BioMed Central requires written confirmation from all authors that they agree with any proposed changes in authorship of submitted manuscripts. We would therefore need to ask that all authors complete our change of authorship form, which can be downloaded from https://resource-cms.springernature.com/springer-cms/rest/v1/content/7454878/data/v5.

Please read the instructions in the form carefully, and return the form within 14 days with all signatures (including from any newly proposed/removed co-author(s)) to BMCSeriesEditorial@biomedcentral.com.

Response:
We have submitted a signed Change of Authorship Form for addition of author Nur Ita and author Suhendro Suwarto on Jan 9th, 2019.

We had sent the letter of Change of Authorship Form (including Suhendro Suwarto’s sign in it) along with the submission of this revised manuscript.
3. Figure 7

-- Please state in the cover letter whether the image depicted in figure 7 is your own or taken from another source. If taken from another source please acknowledge the source in the figure legend, and if it is under copyright also state the written permission given to use and adapt it.

If the above conditions are not met the image needs to be removed. Please note the editors may request proof of permission at any time.

Should you require an alternative source you may wish to try Wikimedia Commons: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Main_Page

Response:

Thank you for your comment. The image in Figure 7 is an original work from the authors under copyright license no. 000157862 registered on October 9th, 2019

We have added caption for figure 7 “Figure courtesy of Dita Aditianingsih, MD, PhD. Permission to reuse the figure in any form must be obtained directly from Dr. Aditianingsih.” (page 35, line 835–836)

4. Funding

-- In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body/bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response:

Thank you for your comment. We have added the role of the funding body under the ‘Funding’ section “The grant funded the data collection, analysis, and interpretation of data.” (page 26, line 593–594)

5. Cite

-- Please ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text. Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication.

Response:

Thank you for your comment. We have checked and ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text

Table 1 (page 13, line 297)
6. Tracked Changes

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:

We have uploaded the manuscript revision as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. Figures and additional files remain uploaded as separate files. All figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.

7. Trial
-- Please state whether the trial was retrospectively or prospectively registered under trial registration.

BMC Anesthesiology operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Response:

Thank you for your comment. We have added the prospective trial registration information:

- under trial registration "prospectively registered on July 17th, 2017" (page 4, line 98) in the abstract,
- in Methods section “This study was registered prospectively on July 17th, 2017 in ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT:03219398).” (page 7, line 163–164) and
- Declaration section “…was registered prospectively on July 17th, 2017 in ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT:03219398)” (page 25, line 578)

Reviewer #4

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors did a great job in adapting the paper to my numerous requests and must be commended.

Response:

Thank you for your review and assessment

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I have few minor comments left:

1) Level of precision of p values: please report only 1 decimal when the p is not statistically significant. For example, in table 1, "0.223" can be changed into "0.2" and "0.291" into "0.3".

Response:

Thank you for your comment, we have revised the non-significant p-values into 1 decimal in tables and within text body.
2) Figures 2 to 4: Please, embed a table with the crude values. Otherwise, the boxes are poorly readable.

Response:

Thank you for your suggestion, due to the large data contained, we have decided to put the tables of figure 2–4 crude values in the supplementary material as Additional file 4 (page 15, line 330 and page 17, line 367–368 and line 376) as the additional explanation of the figure and the boxplot.

3) The 2 videoclips are virtually identical, with the exception of the working space which is slightly larger in the 12 mm Hg group. I do not think that a video is needed herein but surely 2 ones are definitively too many. Considering that the 8 mmHg video is of poorer quality, I would delete at least that one.

Response:

Thank you for your suggestion, we added the videos due to the previous reviewer’s request to demonstrate the visualisation of the work in a smaller space of lower pneumoperitoneum pressure 8 mmHg as Additional file 3.

However, if the Editor and the Reviewer decided it is better to remove this additional video, we will follow the decision and remove it from the manuscript.

Thank you for the very constructing suggestions for this manuscript.

Best regards

Dita Aditianingsih MD PhD