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Reviewer’s report:

This is prospective study comparing a traditional TEG instrument with a newer automated TEG instrument. The study is very well written and fills a scientific gap. I have some comments:

* The inclusion criteria are unclear. Please provide an exact definition of "TEG as part of standard care". What were the exclusion criteria?

* The authors mention that patients were included consecutively during 7 months (July 2015 to January 2016) but only 25 patients were recruited. Is this really accurate in a tertiary hospital in a large city? Seems as surprisingly few patients.

* Were any patients missed, i.e. how many patients that should have had a TEG taken as "part of standard care" were missed?

* How many patients or blood analyses were missed due to indeterminate or missing data?

* Were all blood samples from unique patients?

* When were blood samples taken? Directly after admission or just before discharge or at random. It would make sense to identify a point in time when the TEG values were expected to be as pathological as possible. Was this done?

* I miss a detailed description of the included patients. Anticoagulants treatment during sampling? Severity of illness score? Etc.

* What was the coefficient of variation (CV) for the tests in your laboratory?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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