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Reviewer's report:

Dear associate Editor,

The article is adequately written and the subject discussed could be sufficiently relevant for the journal. The introduction of a new dedicated needle and suture for uterine compression sutures (UCSs) could improve the surgical technique in emergency conditions, such as the post partum hemorrhage (PPH). Moreover, major PPH requiring UCSs is relatively rare and there are not many reports in the literature. Publication of studies on this topic could be therefore useful for good practice and future research.

The data presented are retrospectively obtained from author's database, with a good number of cases. The comparison is among groups treated with different needles/sutures and techniques. In particular, the authors describe the introduction of a new needle/suture to perform Hayman sutures. This blunt straight needle seems to be developed by the authors themselves, and the entire article seems mainly focused on its usefulness, rather than on the comparison between techniques and materials.

My main recommendations and observations are the following:

The comparison between group A and B leading to the first conclusion seems appropriate, but group B and C cannot be compared without highlighting that different surgical techniques are used. The comparison is not between different needles/sutures, but between different surgical techniques (including different steps and materials, such as needles etc.). Considering this, discussion and conclusions should be modified.

The "simplicity" (Page 11, line 236) to perform the Hayman suture with the blunt straight needle shouldn't be mentioned as a result in the discussion or conclusion (Page 14, line 297), as the research is not focused on parameters describing it. In particular, it is not correct to state that Author's needle "could perform modified Hayman suture more easily compared with commercially available needle and suture types" as a conclusion of the paper, since Authors did not compare different needles on the same surgical technique (Hayman suture) in the study. The
author herself remarks this point writing that "Further studies are expected to show the efficacy and simplicity of 2-Monodiox®". On the other hand, this observation could be reported as an Author's opinion in the discussion section. Consequently, the conclusion about the comparison between groups B and C, according to Author's results, seems to be that B-Lynch with circle blunt needle/1-Monocryl and Hayman with 2-Monodiox (straight blunt needle) perform similarly in terms of outcomes.

The introduction should be improved. It could be enriched by few more sentences about needles and sutures used to date for UCSs, comparison among them, etc.

Page 7, lines 133-136: Here the Authors describe materials and methods used in their institution.

Probably would be better to move these concepts from the introduction to the appropriate section, "Materials and Methods".

Page 9, line 171: Please explain better since when the new needle has been used in your institution.

Page 10, lines 194-203: Here the Authors describe again materials used in their institution. Probably would be better to move these concepts from the "results" section to the "Materials and Methods" one.

Page 11, lines 237-239: Here it is not clear what the author means. Please explain better.

Page 13, lines 271-275: Here it is not clear what the author means. Please explain better.
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