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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript addresses an important current controversial issue of EVH vs OVH, and whether the change in harvesting technique has any short, intermediate or long term implications.

Clearly a lot of work has gone into this manuscript.

There are a no. of difficulties with the paper, most of which are acknowledged. The 2 groups are not contemporaneous, obviously non randomised, and subject to different durations of f.u.. In the case of the OVH gp., clinical f.u. is limited to 58% of the pt. gp. It is underpowered.

Angiographic f.u. for reasons given is v. limited.

Notwithstanding the series is controlled for surgical personnel.

4 of the 10 ( or 11 ?) deaths in the OVH group are indeterminate.

I am not sure that the study does satisfactorily answer whether EVH c.f. OVH does have adverse imlications.

It does however give this highly regarded surgeon reassurance over his adoption of EVH to his practice.

The manuscript is well written. There are only minor syntax, typos. Line 9, para 2, pg 4 - looking. I didn’t follow para 2 pg 10.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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