**Review Summary for TEG-a**

In this reviewer’s understanding, the paper’s main points can be summarized as follows:

Obesity increases perioperative risks for patients, especially the risk of thrombosis. Higher clot strengths, as measured 2 weeks following surgery, may not be well treated by heparin alone. Studies have shown that a decrease in body mass index, achieved with or without weight-loss surgery, has a positive effect on the fibrinolytic system and that weight loss following bariatric surgery is linked to improved thrombin and coagulation profiles. In a previous study, the same authors collected the perioperative coagulation profiles of patients who underwent gastric bypass surgery. This current study measured coagulation profiles of 67 patients from that earlier study 1 to 2+ years after gastric bypass to determine if there was a relationship between improvement in coagulation profiles and the percentage of excess weight lost. Positive correlations were found when excess weight loss was more than 50%, with the most significant improvements occurring by about 1 year post-surgery.

The paper’s strengths include a strong literature review, a good explanation of the study data, and potential implications for surgery recommendations.

The following are some specific suggestions that might be helpful for readers and reviewers:

**Hypothesis / research question:**

A clear research question is the first thing most reviewers look for because it frames the entire article. It is usually put forth as a strong statement defining what question the study was designed to answer and why that question is important for patient care.

The specific research question of this paper is unclear. The background section initially mentions an assumption about the possible ineffectiveness of LMW heparin as a treatment, but that is not the focus of the study. The background also cites several studies indicating that weight loss after bariatric surgery improves coagulation profiles and reduces the risk of thromboembolism, which *is* the main topic of study. However, while the background section outlines what other researchers have found, it does not clearly define how *this* study aims to contribute new knowledge on the topic.

In order to make a stronger case as to why this study merits a journal’s attention, I recommend adding a clearly stated research aim as the last sentence of the background section, perhaps following a format similar to this:

We investigated the change in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to determine whether there was a correlation between \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Such a statement will greatly improve reviewers’ ability to quickly identify your study goals and methods, as well as the novelty of your findings.

**Methods**

Adding a few details to the Methods section will help readers understand the process you used. In particular, I recommend describing the previous study, of which this one is a continuation. The paper currently states, “The same technique was used as in our previous study on the same patient cohort.” It would be much more informative to explain the previous technique in enough detail so that readers do not have to locate and read the earlier article in order to understand your current study’s methods.

It might also be helpful to give more information about the hospital and/or geographic location where this study was conducted, if doing so does not violate patient confidentiality.

**Findings and Discussion:**

I left a few comments in the Findings and Discussion sections of your manuscript suggesting clarifications that might add useful information.

**Tables and Figures:**

Reviewers often look first to tables and figures for an initial picture of the study purpose, data, and results. Overall, the tables and figure give a good summary of findings. I left a few quick comments/queries where some additional details might make the tables even clearer.

Also, a Table 5 is mentioned in the paper, but only 4 tables are provided; that may warrant a second look.

**Grammar and clarity:**

Grammar and style issues are not a reviewer’s main focus, but if a reviewer is distracted by unclear sentences, it can affect his or her overall recommendation. I believe it would be worthwhile to have the paper professionally edited, particularly to clarify certain sentences where the meaning is unclear. I left a few comments seeking clarification, but a thorough grammar edit will help find any other discrepancies.