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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions:
1. English needs to be reviewed. There are some grammar mistakes;
2. - Abstract section line 2 “It’s” # “Its
- Abstract section line 6 “include” # “includes”
- Abbreviations were not stated; for example page 3 line 2 “EF”, page 4 line 9 “CPB” “OPCAB”
3. Introduction line 1 : The first sentence must be united with the second one.
4. Page 4 line 6 “straight forward” # “straightforward”
5. Page 7 line 18 “ To avoid …..” The inverted sentence should be re-written
6. Page 8 line 3 “obsticale” # “obstacle”
7. Page 9 line 6 “ Found that ……” incomplete sentence

Discretionary Revisions

8. Patients and methods section page 5 line 1 “can” “could”. Did the authors find any difference in dimensions (left ventricular end diastolic diameters and volumes) in patients who could not tolerate the manipulation of the heart in whom they switched from beating heart to on-pump beating heart surgery? Did patients with bigger end-diastolic diameters need change to on-pump beating heart?
9. When applying even on-pump beating heart in bad ventricle some cases can not tolerate the position of circumflex bypass procedure and distention of the left ventricle can be seen. Did the authors meet such a case? If they did what did they prefer to do to ameliorate the distension?

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