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Reviewer's report:

The paper is well written with no errors that I could find. This is a timely and relevant paper addressing the issue of graft patency after endoscopic vein harvest. It is a retrospective study from only one centre but that centre has significant experience in the technique. However to examine graft patency the study is probably somewhat underpowered. There was no difference in mortality or in clinical endpoints of recurrent angina or readmission. The advantage of endoscopic harvesting was shown in a reduction in leg wound complications and a non significant trend towards better self rated health scores.

The paper is well written throughout and clear. Tables and graphs are all very well constructed and are to be commended for their clarity. The conclusions are stated accurately and recognise the limitations of the work.

This is a small and underpowered retrospective study but addresses an important issue for surgeons. Provided the Editors are accepting of such a study for publication I feel the message is an interesting one from a unit which clearly has much experience with the technique in the UK and undertook the study to reassure themselves regarding the safety of the technique in their hands. The paper is commendably clear and well written in every respect.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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