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Reviewer's report:

I have read manuscript draft "Comparison of modified MAZE with minimally invasive monopolar ablation and traditional bipolar radiofrequency ablation in the treatment of atrial fibrillation." I believe this is a good study regarding two modalities in two separate cohorts (mi-MAZE and os-MAZE) for which are compared. I understand that there is no significant difference in the atrial fibrillation ablation rate following 3 months and postoperative quality of life marginally improved with mi-MAZE. The manuscript does not disclose the methods in which patients were chose to either cohort (preference, proceduralist choice, anatomy, cost.) The manuscript does not mention the type of atrial fibrillation encountered by the patients (persistent, paroxysmal, permanent) A 3 month follow-up is great timing, some document freedom at a much longer follow-up, it would interesting in comparison to see if this changes. Few syntax errors present (every . or , should be following a word and not floating, used is misspelled twice)
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