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Reviewer's report:

General
I read with interest the paper by Omran et al. After careful reading I have the following comments and questions:

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. Although the authors analyzed a considerable number of CABG patients they detected only 44 cases of SWI. What is the power of the study to detect differences among the groups analyzed? Do the authors think that their study has sufficient power?
2. I miss other important potential risk factors from this study (i.e. renal failure, sepsis, endocarditis, COPD and emergent operation). What do the authors think of their impact on SWI?
3. What is the discrimination ability and the calibration of the multivariate logistic regression model?
4. What are the percentages of the bilateral internal thoracic artery used in each group? What method did the authors use? (pedicle or skeletonized?).
5. Do the authors have any midterm or long-term survival data? It is known from the literature that DSWI affects also long-term mortality in CABG patients.
6. Did the authors use any risk stratification system (i.e. EuroSCORE or STS)? Was there any correlation with the risk stratification system?
7. There are many mistakes in the references used. Sometimes the authors provide the first names instead of the last names. They should correct references 1,3,4,6,7,12).

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. The entire manuscript needs some language corrections.

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

-------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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