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**Reviewer's report:**

General:
This paper presents evidence that there is a proportion of patients who are turned down for cardiac surgery based on the premise that they are "too high risk". Could this be due to the surgeon being influenced by the spectre of publication of his outcomes?

It is very difficult to answer this question, but this paper is the first which attempts to present numbers, where in the past there has only been "anecdotal evidence".

In my opinion every centre must have a formal, multi-disciplinary meeting where not-so-straightforward cases are discussed. Also, every patient who is turned down for surgery must have the benefit of a formal second opinion.

I would support publication of this paper as it discusses a very important topic.
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**What next?:** Accept without revision

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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