Reviewer's report

Title: Radial Artery vs Saphenous Vein Graft Used as the Second Conduit for Surgical Myocardial Revascularization: Long-term Clinical Follow-up

Version: 3 Date: 19 June 2015

Reviewer: James Tatoulis

Reviewer's report:

Comments to the Authors

The authors have responded point by point to the previous comments and questions. Further comments that should be addressed included -

• A description of the intraoperative antispasm regimen used for the radial arteries – topical papaverine or other agent? Intraluminal papaverine or other vasodilatory agent? Intraoperative or perioperative general intravenous infusions such as GTN, or other, etc – if indeed the authors used such regimens.

• Despite this nice study, I remain unconvinced that 100 patients in each group, with a mean age of 56-57 years, followed for just 8 years is sufficiently powered to show a difference.

• A more appropriate conclusion would be,

“In this small randomised study our data indicate that there is no difference in the 8 year clinical outcomes in patients of 56-57 years of age between those having a radial artery or a saphenous vein graft used as a second conduit, beside LITA, for surgical myocardial revascularisation.”