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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors,

While Your article is truly important to everyone in the field on congenital heart surgery, there are some major issues.

First off all, you fail to explain the nature of the study. Is the study retrospective? Is it prospective? The data was gathered from two centers. The authors state that the operations were performed by the same team of surgeons, but were the patients treated by the same ICU, ward staff?

Secondly, you provide very little information about statistical analysis: was the distribution of the continuous variables tested? If it was, what statistical test were used? What tests were used to compare the differences between the groups? How did you allocate the patients to either treatment group? As I understand, at first the authors used one technique then switched to the other? The first technique was used by one surgeon only, while the later technique was used by five surgeons. What is the timeline of study? When in time was each technique used?

The conclusions of the abstract and the main article are different. The authors should try to keep consistency between the abstract and the main article.

At this stage, the does not (and due to the lack of the description of the study design and statistical analysis methods is not able to provide) provide the answer or insight to the question which technique of coronary ostia reimplantation would be safer (with regards to coronary related mortality and morbidity, and neoaortic valve function).

Lastly, there are some grammar, punctuation mistakes, and some editorial errors (like table 1, which should provide preoperative data, but also provides operative date, such as CPB time, aortic cross-clamp time).

At this point, the article needs extensive revisions in order to be published.

Despite the fact that I recommend to reject this version of the article, I am waiting for the authors to make revisions and then publish a potentially very interesting article.
Best wishes,

Karolis JONAS, MD

Congenital heart surgeon
Vilnius University Heart Surgery Centre
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