Review 1

1. The title reflects the main subject but this is common anesthetic procedure, it did not new scientific concept.

2. Abstract is poorly written will lot of grammatically errors.

-> We rewrote Abstract section according to Hanyang University E-world edditing center.

3. Keywords are ok.

4. The whole background need to revised again , Check the English again , some sentences makes very confusing. -> We corrected background section.

5. The conclusion has no any specific outcome.-> We rewrote conclusion.

6. In method section the authors should describe why they choose this method for monitoring? what are the advantages over other methods? -> We described the reasin why we used pulse pressure variation monitor in this case.

7. The figures are not relevant because this case is about anesthetic monitoring not surgical procedure. -> We redraw figure files and deleted operation figure (fig 2).

8. The authors can add tables of graphs of whole monitoring period if they find some changes. Also English need to be improved and rechecked.

Review 2

(1).The main determinants of the pulse pressure (Pp) is the stroke volume (SV)and arterial compliance (C), such that Pp = SV/C. Pulse pressure is highly dependent on stroke volume, and is therefore influenced by all factors which determine stroke volume (preload, afterload and contractility ). Pulse pressure variation predicts fluid responsiveness in mechanically ventilated patients passively adapted to the ventilator. (2).The pulse pressure variation is much reliable on the new version of some non-invasive cardiac output monitors. This case report may accept for publication.

-> T h a n k y o u !