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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
This study is a sub-study of another study published by the authors. This was not mentioned in the original submission and it is still not clearly stated in the re-submission. This is not acceptable. Data from the same pigs are published in two separate studies this should be clearly stated in the introduction and methods section.

It’s a surprise to the reviewer that the first re-submission didn’t include a detailed response to the reviewers questions, this is standard!

Hence many of the reply to the questions haven’t been incorporated in the manuscript.

In response to the reviewer the authors write: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out, as it deserves some editing. In fact, animals were given 7 cc/kg of Karo® syrup. The amount given in the original manuscript reflects the maximum amount given. The text in the manuscript has been changed to the following (line 46):
This is not corrected in the manuscript version submitted. This has to be changed.

The authors should include the reference from which the dose of Karo® syrup was taken from.

The authors write:
We appreciate that the reviewer noticed this and have added a citation to Dr. Determan’s paper in the methods (line 39):

Again the reviewer can’t see that this have been changed?

Regarding power calculation the authors write This was done in consult with a statistician. A power of 80% and type 1 error of 5% were assumed in these calculations.

That is simply not enough. The authors need to include a statement regarding this and if a statistician performed this, he/she should be able to write in details what he has done! Since all three reviewers commented on this is it’s a surprise that the authors have included a statement in the manuscript regarding this
The reviewer acknowledges that the authors have included hemodynamic variables as a supple. But please present the data in a proper way in a table or a graph instead of just a supple with comma separated variables!

The authors should go through the paper again and make sure that all changes included in the reply to the reviewers are included.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.