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September 13, 2012

Dr. Vipin Zamvar,

Thank you for your detailed viewer report for our research article. Based upon the excellent suggestions, we have edited the paper. We have made the following revisions (all noted below):

1. Changes to the discussion. The limitation and conclusion sections have been modified.
2. Changes to the tables including corrected titles and rearranged information.

Please review the revised manuscript and consider it for publication in your journal.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Darryl M. Hoffman, M.D., F.R.C.S.

Dr. Schwann’s comments:

**RE: Improving long term outcome for diabetic patients undergoing surgical revascularization by use of the Radial artery conduit; a propensity matched study**

“The Discussion Section is unfocused and strays from the main powerful message of the study i.e. RA in conjunction of LIMA and supplemental SVG grafting increases long term survival compared to the LIMA/SVG configuration in diabetics. There are unnecessary and extraneous tangential details that clutter that message and should be removed. The last sentence of the first page of the Discussion does not belong in this section. **Removed**

Reference 18 does not involve RA and provides no patency data. **Reference 19 (Not 18)**

Regarding their discussion of Reference 23: the discussion of the findings is inaccurate (long term survival of RA and SVG was identical) and the point of the entire discussion around this reference is unclear at best and needs modification. Referral to the unmatched patient population raises risk of confounding of the outcomes data quoted die to baseline patient characteristics differences. **Section deleted and rewritten**

Regarding the discussion of endoscopic graft harvesting, their assertions are unsupported by any data in the manuscript and should be removed or comparative data from other studies should be provided to support this assertion. Again this is not the aim of the study and dilutes the message. **Deleted**
The Limitations Section: The second sentence makes no sense. Specifically what is meant by the “largest single site consecutive experience”? -Deleted

The Conclusion Section: The second sentence is by far too sweeping and not supported as there is no comparisons no diabetic group to support the conclusion that “the radial artery can overcome the previously universally acknowledged worse long term survival…” This implies that RA in diabetics approximates survival in non diabetics….clearly not supported by data. -Deleted and rewritten

Minor Essential Revisions –All changes below were made

The Methods sections define GROUP RA and GROUP SV. Tables and figures should be labeled consistently.
Table 1 – Should be labeled as patient demographics and as such morality data should not be included.
Table 2 – Should be labeled as Operative Outcomes. HbA1C should be in Table 1
Table 3 – Same as above. Mortality is not a Preoperative Data
Table 4 – Same as above
Consistent labeling of TABLES 1 and 3 and 2 and 4.”