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Reviewer's report:

This is well conducted experimental study on a current topic that has attracted research interest for almost 4 decades in the field of cardiac surgery. One has to look at the wealth of available literature on myocardial reperfusion injury on one hand, and the comparison between BCP (Blood Cardioplegia) and CCP (Crystalloid Cardioplegia) on the other, to realise the scale of the challenge we still face.

The background literature search was very good, the methodology was easy to read through and the right statistical tools were used for analysis.

I do have a question with the numbers in the result section.

Of the 50 hearts, BCP was given to 25 and CCP given to the other 25. It would be interesting to know how many of the 18 rats in the infarcted group, received either cardioplegia (BCP or CCP)? As the study question focuses mainly on post myocardial infarction, I guess this number would be very small to come to the drawn conclusion.

The study confirms preceding findings and sheds much light on their conflicting results.

The authors acknowledged the limitations of the study to which I would add the small sample size where these results were observed.

The rise in LVEDP (Left Ventricular End Diastolic Pressure) noted during the ischemic period with CCP is a valid point for future studies to focus on, and this will require larger samples to come to a meaningful conclusion and extrapolate the findings to clinical practice.

Overall, this is a good article that gives insight in to the 2 forms of cardioplegia currently available to cardiac surgeons. It is valuable addition to the current literature for future research and I support it for publication.
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