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Reviewer's report:

General
This manuscript presents important work on comparative analysis between coagulation by laboratory methods and immediate patient diagnosis on the day of the dental surgery procedure for patients undergoing oral anticoagulation therapy. The manuscript clearly justifies the purpose of the study. Overall the manuscript was well designed and the results provide important information. In general the statistical analysis is adequate and appropriate.

The manuscript does require some editing, as there are numerous instances of "sloppiness" in the text with regard to grammar, typo errors, etc.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. Background part: factor II instead 11
2. Methods part: First sentence describing patients is not clear and need to be rewritten
3. Pathrombin SL should be explained in the text-Methods part.
4. Coagu Chek should be spelled same in the text and Figures and used consistently.
5. Figure 6 PT Coaguchek +PT Labor) should be changed into PT CoaguChek+PT Laboratory

Discritionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1. Methods part: parodontological treatment could be changed into periodontal treatment
2. Results part: 33% of the patients that were treated with a local flap reconstruction developed secondary bleeding. Is that statistically significant? Should it be used as a treatment option? Is there similar report from the literature? If it is an important issue it might be good to explain it. Explain the results in the Table1 briefly.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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