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Reviewer's report:

1) CCS class is an ordinal data and should not be presented in continuous form. I am sure statistic purist would agree with this. It may be 'easier to comprehend' in number term as mentioned by the authors. But does not make any clinical sense. Although we have to accept that many data had been presented this way in some high-impact publications.

2) Now that the missing data in GTN use have been addressed, can the authors confirmed that there was no missing data for CCS classes apart from those due to death or exclusion from study as this will affect the percentage presented in the result section and Figure 2? Therefore, I feel that it is important to include the number of patients (n= xx) in Figures 1 and 2 A-C at all follow-up intervals.

3) This study does not add any new information to the literature. The authors have quoted some of the previous studies (Reference 9 to 11) and pointing out that they were American studies but there has been at least one European/UK study (Reference 13).