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**Reviewer’s report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1-In the text, there is no information about which technique was applied to which patients. Do elderly patients suitable for VAC?
2- The mechanism of the VAC therapy should be explained.
3- The conventional treatment technique should be detailed. (ie, for closed irrigation which material do you use).
3- Do you use bilateral IMA for CABG patients.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1- Check the context of the tables, there are some spelling mistakes.
2- On the page 5 and first paragraph, I think, 'extensive sternotomy was avoided' will be 'extensive sternectomy was avoided'.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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