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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors report a retrospective analysis of early and mid-term outcomes in patients undergoing re-do CABG using extended RITA with RA. In-hospital results and follow-up outcomes are excellent. I have some comments and questions for the authors.

1. Please define clearly the indications for this method in the Methods section. How many re-do patients did the authors treat during the same time period? Of those, what led them to use this method? How about other patients?
2. The number of anastomosed vessels is listed in Table 2 but the details of anastomosed vessels should be described in the same table.
3. Were LITAs in all patients used in previous procedures? Were all of them patent at the latest procedure? The information of previous procedures should also be described in the Methods section.
4. Figures 2 and 3 are not in the manuscript even though the authors commented on them in the Results section.
5. A representative postoperative angiogram would be valuable.
6. During follow-up, two patients had angina class 3–4. Did they receive further medication or percutaneous coronary intervention?
7. A possible weak point of this composite and sequential graft is that flow is dependent on one in situ RITA. The authors should discuss this drawback.
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