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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
The question is relevant to current myocardial revascularisation practice.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
This is a retrospective study.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
The number of patients who had LIMA to LAD is 1,743 and those who had RIMA to LAD were 244 so this is 1,987 in total, provided that the total number of in-situ BIMA patients is 1,977 this means that 10 patients had both LIMA and RIMA used to graft the LAD or this is simply a calculation error, could you please clarify this point.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
From the numbers of target vessels, it is obvious that IMA arteries were not used sequentially to graft more than one artery, this means that patients who had more than 2 target coronary vessels must have had supplementary veins (Patients who had radials were excluded). Although the author mentioned the superiority of the (IMA) over the vein grafts regarding the long term patency, he never considered the concomitant use of veins with the in-situ BIMA as an influencing factor to the long term survival.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Is the lower long-term survival in BIMA patients with insulin treated DM due to the duration of the disease and the level of control of blood sugar?

Could the authors elaborate on how the IMA was usually harvested and what is the impact of the harvesting technique on the DSWI and in turn on the long-term outcome?

It would be interesting to discuss the impact of concomitant venous grafting on the long term outcome.
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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