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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is well written and describes interesting data for inflammation and endotoxin permeability in an in vitro dialysis with different membranes.

Critical points:

a) In the "Results", assay compatibility of PVP should be mentioned in the "Methods" because these facts belong to the preparation of the study investigation.

b) Results of permeability of dialysis membranes for bacterial filtrates should be clearly performed in written form. Table 3 makes an inhomogeneous (confused) impression about no or very low endotoxin concentrations in the various examination procedures. Therefore data of table 3 are too exactly to understand the conclusion of this result.

c) In my opinion, table 4 is not necessary. LRV can be reported in 1-2 sentences.

d) Table 6 does not have an additional knowledge compared to the results of table 5. I don't understand the rationale why IL-1ß expression could be different regarding to concentration or percent. The authors should demonstrate this result only in the way which reader understand. I would prefer the performance of IL-1ß expression as concentration.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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