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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

thank you for this manuscript in which you compare coagulation testing quality and predictability.
You try to show the superiority of viscoelastic tests (VET) above standard laboratory tests (STS) in patient requiring urgent neurosurgery.
I have several major concerns:

- the authors report an inhomogenous population of patients including neurotrauma, intracranial bleeding, tumorcompression and more. However, they mainly refer to trauma and trauma induced coagulopathy which confuses the reader.
- 40% (35/92) of the patients received therapeutic dosages of anticoagulants/antiplatelet drugs. I wonder what the results were, if these patients were excluded.
- the definition of blood loss more than 3 RBC’s as relevant seems interesting and the argumentation not adequate (intracranial blood loss does not exceed high volumes), because all patients underwent craniotomy.
- the timing of blood drawing seems different (STS upon admission vs VET after induction of anesthesia). There might be more blood loss or fluid infusion in between.

Finally, the authors suggest an algorithm which they state to implement during their study, while the decision to give blood (derived) products was made upon SLTs, VETs and clinical judgement.
Please find detailed comments in the attached pdf-file.
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