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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review "Is There A Difference In Bleeding After Left Ventricular Assist Device Implant: Centrifugal Versus Axial?" by Dr. Gaffney and colleagues. This manuscript addresses the important matter of postoperative bleeding in patients supported by continuous flow LVADs. The authors find that there is no significant difference in bleeding complications between HM2 and HVAD. However, this manuscript would be strengthened by addressing the following questions:

1. The authors include early mediastinal bleeding in the "non-surgical" bleeding analysis. Given the difference in implant technique, as well as the likelihood that early mediastinal bleeding is related to the operation, it would be useful to separate this type of bleeding from other types: namely mucosal bleeding. Similarly, early pleural space bleeding is again likely related to the operation and not due to a bleeding diathesis.

2. Clinical trials have shown a decrease in bleeding complications with newer devices. It would be valuable to report on the temporal difference in implant periods.

3. The authors mention briefly that the RVAD rate was higher in the HVAD group. This suggests that these patients were more ill, although there is no statistical difference in INTERMACS classification (likely due to low numbers), but there is no further discussion of this statement.

4. The HVAD group also has a higher PTT, suggesting that this group is at higher baseline risk for bleeding (prior to LVAD implantation). This warrants further discussion.
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