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Reviewer's report:

This prospective, randomized trial assesses the impact of 2 different surgical techniques for CABG. This reviewer congratulates the authors for performing a randomized surgical trial!

However, some changes would improve the quality of the manuscript.

Major issues:
1. The first sentence of the abstract should be modified, as it suggests definite evidence on which patients do profit from CABG looking at mortality as an outcome. Also please include a paragraph drawing attention to the controversial issues in both management strategies (re-vascularisation or a conservative approach with drugs) in the BACKGROUND of the manuscript. Keep in mind that of 7 randomized trials conducted 2 decades ago, only 1 found a statistically significant difference in mortality! In addition to that, the advance of medical therapy in ischemic heart disease and heart failure should be discussed.
2. Please prospectively include risks scores (at baseline) and the measurement of NT-proBNP in order to be able to better describe your patient population.
3. What is your SOP concerning anti-platelet therapy (ASS, Prasugrel, Ticagrelor)? Please include a statement on this in your METHODS.
4. You state that the lower risk of stroke may be an advantage of your technique. As you do perform CT scans on your patients for evaluation of the anastomoses, why not include a cranial CT to increase sensitivity to detect strokes (which may be clinically inapparent)?
5. You state that your technique is easier to perform. If this also means faster, it should be stated in the protocol to prospectively assess the operative time.

Minor issues:
The use of an online randomization system is preferred to randomization with envelopes.