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Reviewer's report:

Thank you to the authors of the manuscript "The effectiveness of prehospital hypertonic saline for hypotensive patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis" for providing this well-written and relevant manuscript. The existing literature on the topic is limited, and this meta-analysis expanding on previous work will be beneficial to the field of prehospital medicine. While the manuscript would be acceptable for publication as is, the suggestions below may help to strengthen the manuscript and might be incorporated at the authors discretion. In the introduction, the author's might choose to avoid citing medical textbooks [line 183] in favor of primary literature or guidelines (ATLS, European guideline on bleeding, etc.). In addition, a brief mention of resuscitative strategies, including the concept of targeted resuscitation and "permissive hypotension" versus empiric volume resuscitation, may be useful to the reader. Finally, the discussion later discusses implications for the head injured patient. The authors may wish to include a brief reference to the challenges of resuscitating the hypotensive head injured patient in the prehospital system, where literature guiding management is sorely lacking. The goals of the investigation are clear and the methods are sound and the authors do a very nice job of outlining their search strategy. I applaud the thorough attention to detail in the methods section including a discussion of bias assessment. The results are clearly presented and relevant. They define hypotension as a blood pressure of less than 100 mmHg. However, in the introduction a blood pressure of Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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