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Reviewer’s report:

This paper is presenting the evaluation of a project that aimed in making the ultrasound guided cannulation available around-the-clock for patients with difficult venous access. This study is scientifically valid, and even though it doesn't include a clearly formed research question, it can be deducted by the aim, and the aim seems scientifically sound. The methods are not properly described, but for the results that are not affected by the incomplete description, the analysis seems suitable. My main concern/comment is the lack of description of the data collection methodology and the tools that were used. For example, when and how was pain measured? What type of database the DiVA database was? How and when was it filled out etc.?

In order to improve the quality of the reporting and make sure that you mention all the important aspects of your project I am suggesting the use of one of the EQUATOR (http://www.equator-network.org/) guidelines for reporting scientific results (maybe the SQUIRE checklist).

Minor discretionary suggestion: The many acronyms make the paper difficult to read. Please consider spelling out some of them.

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.

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:
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