

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The primary treatment of rectal carcinoma is laparoscopic surgery, which can induce significant hemodynamic changes and weaken immune function. It is necessary to understand the impact of different anesthesia methods on hemodynamics and oxidative stress during RC. In this retrospective study, by comparing the hemodynamic indices, oxidative stress indices, general data, consumption of remifentanyl, and use of vasoactive agents of patients receiving remifentanyl anesthesia and remifentanyl combined with propofol anesthesia, Huang J and his colleagues concluded that remifentanyl combined with propofol can improve hemodynamics and relieve oxidative stress in patients undergoing RC resection. It's well designed and the manuscript is appropriately written. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work and the background clearly report the present status of research in this field and the significance of the study. I congratulate the authors for their successful work. Language polishing is needed to make best sense of reading. Sincerely

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript and providing constructive comments. We appreciate you recognizing the scientific quality, language quality, and contribution of our study.

Per your suggestions, we have gone through the manuscript and polished the language, especially in the abstract and background sections, to improve readability. We have also double checked the terminology for consistency. These changes have improved the flow and clarity of the writing.

We are pleased that you found the study design appropriate and the manuscript well-written overall. Your encouraging comments about the novelty and significance of our findings give us confidence that our work contributes meaningfully to the field.

Thank you again for reviewing our paper so thoughtfully. We hope the revisions have addressed your recommendations for minor language polishing. We look forward to any additional feedback you may have. Your guidance has helped improve our manuscript.

Sincerely

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The article with the title "Effects of remifentanyl

combined with propofol on hemodynamics and oxidative stress in patients undergoing resection of rectal carcinoma” is in generally well done. Authors evaluated the effects of remifentanyl combined with propofol on the hemodynamics and oxidative stress in patients undergoing rectal carcinoma surgery. These findings indicate that this combination improves hemodynamic stability, reduces oxidative stress, and results in a lower incidence of hypotension than sufentanil alone. The design is smart and elegant. Overall, the work is well-written and the results are quite interesting. The figures and tables help the readers to make a more understanding of the study. However, some concerns have been noted including: -The results of operation, anesthesia and extubation time in the two groups are only presented in the pictures at present. Are there more exact data? -Regarding the occurrence of adverse reactions, the description in the results section is too simple. I suggested that the main adverse reactions should also be described in the text results.

Dear Reviewer #2,

First and foremost, we extend our sincere gratitude for your detailed and insightful review. Your suggestions are invaluable in enhancing the quality of our manuscript.

In response to your specific comments on our article titled "Effects of remifentanyl combined with propofol on hemodynamics and oxidative stress in patients undergoing resection of rectal carcinoma," we have made the necessary revisions and additions.

Following your recommendation, we have included a new table, now referred to as Table 2, which provides detailed data regarding surgery, anesthesia, and extubation times. This table is intended to offer more precise and comprehensive data to better understand the comparisons between the two groups of patients.

Additionally, we have enriched the results section with a detailed description of the main adverse reactions. This addition aims to offer readers a more complete perspective on the adverse reactions observed in our study and their frequency.

We look forward to your feedback on these revisions and are grateful for your contribution to improving the quality of our research.

Awaiting your further guidance and suggestions.

Sincerely,