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Reviewer's report:

Well written paper dealing with an interesting issue. Despite that, the study needs major revisions, as follows, in order to strengthen the key messages.

1. Really poor-quality images, please assess.

2. As already known, it seems quite clear STS score is the most reliable tool in predicting CABG mortality even in octogenarians. Nevertheless, it would be very interesting to add a comparison between models performances either in terms of ROC curves comparison or Net Reclassification Improvement (prefferable in my opinion) in order to assess quantitatively the superiority of the STS score in predicting mortality in this subset of patients with respect to the other EuroSCORE algorithms.

3. Analysis of the Add EuroSCORE is really redundant and somewhat confounding, please remove.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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