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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript by Matsuzaki et al. provides a retrospective study evaluating the role of blunt straight needles and sutures for uterine compression. The management of post-partum haemorrhage remains a challenging issue, and it continues to be worldwide the first cause of maternal death.

For these reasons, the originality and scientific relevance of the presented study seems adequate.

On the other hand, some criticisms have to be raised:

General points:

a) The authors should be aware that despite the quite relevant number of women enrolled, given the low incidence of severe postpartum bleeding the entire statistical analysis has been performed using a low number of events. This point represents the most relevant study limitation, and it should be clearly disclosed in the Discussion section.

b) I appreciate the choice of dividing the whole series in three groups based on the type of surgical approach employed. However, to clarify which specific factor may be more relevant in favouring uterus preservation the authors should carry on a multivariate analysis including in the model each variable (B-lynch, Hayman, needle, parity, etc…). I think this point is mandatory to drive reliable conclusions, and the authors should perform this analysis in the revised manuscript version.

c) Did the authors used uterine artery embolization to control bleeding?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

Yes

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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