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**Reviewer’s report:**

Thank you so much for the opportunity to review this paper. This is an interesting paper of a pilot trial assessing the feasibility of a novel wireless vital signs monitoring system in the post-operative context. The objective of the paper addresses an important topic and a strength of the paper is a thorough literature review and a compelling rationale for the intervention. The paper is well-organized and adheres to the CONSORT reporting criteria for pilot and feasibility studies.

I’d also like to provide a couple of comments for the authors’ consideration:

1. The authors stated that the study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov retrospectively. Is there a reason or rationale for why this wasn't done prospectively? Providing more information regarding whether any deviations from protocol in study conduct or omission of certain outcomes in the reporting would help strengthen this point.

2. It appears that the power calculation for the subsequent RCT is based on the event rate reported in the literature. Since the event rate in the present pilot trial was lower than that reported in the literature (possibly due to healthier patients in the study wards), is there reason to suspect that this issue will persist in the RCT? How do the characteristics of the eligible patients admitted to the ICU post-operatively differ from those randomized into the study (if this information is available)?
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