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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Background: It is very bulky repeating a lot of things and in some aspects looking as a discussion section. It has to be cut to at least the half size.

2. Methods: A clear description of the experiment has to be given. Important information is missing. For example how many months these experiments lasted in total? Was the operation made by the same surgical team? Why was such a big variety in the time the pigs were sacrificed? Were there subgroups of 4 months and others for 8 months follow-up? Otherwise the time the bovine patch stayed in the circulation is not constant and this may bias the results.

3. Methods: There has been an attempt to evaluate the results in a quantitative manner but of course this is not pure quantification, and is subjected to systemic bias according to the reader. In my opinion there had to be at least two readers of the results and the inter-observer variation to be calculated.

4. Discussion: It is very bulky causing some confusion to the reader. I suggest cutting it a lot and mainly focusing on the most important findings of the study, thus the differences between the two graft surfaces.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The background has to be revised; it gives inadequate information about the study.

2. Methods: line 1: the manufacturer of the patch has to be stated clearly here and not in the discussion.

3. Results: the results about the patch sutured in the peritoneum are not even mentioned in the results section. There is only some statement in the discussion section.

Discretionary Revisions

1. It seems better to put some arrows in the figures, thus making it easier for the reader to understand them.

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
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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