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Author's response to reviews: see over
Influence of 4 % icodextrin solution on peritoneal tissue response, adhesion formation and wound healing.

Dear Editor,

thank you very much for your thorough evaluation of our manuscript. We have responded to all comments from the reviewers and my associates and I would appreciate your considering the revision of our paper for publication. We highlighted all changes in our manuscript. The submitted work is not being considered elsewhere and has not been published in any language. None of the authors has a financial conflict of interest.

Thanks again for the opportunity to resubmit our revised manuscript and we hope that the manuscript is now suitable for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Klink
Reviewer1:
Well designed, executed and described methodology. Results are consistent with literature and current experimental studies. The issue of wound healing requires long term animal protocols, regarding either ultimate results or thorough clarification of pathophysiology. Taking such a consideration into account 'wound healing' could be omitted from the title. Interesting set up for further studies

We deleted 'wound healing' from the title.

Reviewer2:
Ladies and Gentlemen
thank you very much for the opportunity to review this interesting article on the prevention of adhesion of icodextrin solution and peritoneal response by Klink et. al. Overall, the experiment is sound and the results open new perspectives or confirm results by previous investigators. However, the Discussion part should be carefully revised by the authors. Here, in general, the authors tend to overinterpret their results. This should be made more cautiously do the nature of this animal experiment.

We carefully revised the discussion part not overinterpreting our results. We highlighted all changes within the text.

In addition, the authors should state their financial independence.

We added our financial independence within the text.

Moreover, the reviewer has made several comments within an altered pdf file uploaded via the BMC Surgery homepage. These comments should also be addressed by the authors.

We changed all reviewers’ demands within the text. We highlighted all changes within the text.

Editorial comments:
Please include Authors’ Contributions, Competing Interests, and a Conclusions section in your manuscript.

We included Authors’ Contributions, Competing Interests, and a Conclusions section in our manuscript.
We feel that your manuscript would benefit from some improvements being made to the style and grammar of written English. We would therefore recommend that you ask a native English speaking colleague to help you copyedit the paper.

The manuscript was revised by a native English speaking colleague. All changes are highlighted within the text.