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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? I believe they are well supported but I would like to see more description, specifically how did the authors decide who to put on ECMO and who to manage conventionally, what where the type, size and site of the ECMO cannulae used, how much blood and products were transfused and what steps were taken to control bleeding on ECMO with regard to heparin management, use of anti-fibrinolytics and surgical techniques
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? No
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? No, the English is execrable and needs a complete revision.

In conclusion this is potentially an excellent paper worthy of publication, but it needs some minor adjustment of content and a major overhaul of the English prior to publication. I congratulate the authors on their excellent results and would be happy to review the revised version.