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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a randomized controlled study to examined the effect of cardiac output based perioperative care on the incidence of acute lung injury. I have some comment. 1. Please put a line number for reviewer’s convenience. 2. (P1, L16) Please explain the reason the authors focused the effect on postoperative lung not kidney injury. 3. (P1, L6 from the bottom) VIS needs an explanation. 4. (P1, L4 from the bottom) IL, TNF, cTnI, NT and BNP need an explanation. 5. (P2, L4) acute kidney injury (AKI) is right? 6. (P4, L16) What is FiO2? 7. (P4, L18) What is PETCO2? 8. (P4, L9 from the bottom, as PRAM/Mostcare) Does it mean that CI and SVI can be monitored by PRAM/Mostcare using the data from central venous catheter and a-line in the radial artery? Is the Swan-Ganz not needed? The detail of the mechanism is needed. 9. (P5, L11 from the bottom) What is MAP? 10. (P5, L4 from the bottom) The definition of ALI should be described. 11. (P7, L3 from the bottom) Are there some data of ALI incidence after “human” liver transplantation (not rat)? I feel the incidences in the present study (45% in the control and 28 in the CO-G group) are high. 12. (P8, L4 from the bottom, P9, L17, P9 L7 from the bottom) Put a line between the subsections of Discussion section. 13. (P9, L7 from the bottom) The number of the subject was set by calculating alpha<0.05 and beta power. Please explain the authors think the sample size in the present study is still small. 14. (P9, L4 from the bottom) Put a line between the Discussion and Conclusion sections. 15. Figure legends are necessary which I can not find.
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