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Reviewer's report:

Interesting study, as usually experimental models are in such a field. Nevertheless, some doubt could raise about the importance of the subject: early surgery in myocardial acute ischemia is, today, a lot less applied compared to the past and, with some exceptions, the modern strategy is to wait as long as possible before surgery.

Regarding the article, I found quite confusing the chapter "experimental model", in which many details about the methods are explained referring to an another article (ref. n. 13, in which is actually NOT better depicted) and again, in other words, repeated in the very next chapter "Cardioplegia", originally, I imagine, dedicated to the only cardioplegia strategies.

Many other details are not very well explained. Since surgeons are usually not familiar with rat's hearts, I think it could be important to explain the reason for the total amount of CCP solution used and the administered pressure indicated. 30 ml ai 50-70 mmHg are data very different from cardiac surgeon routine experience...

Another distance from cardiac surgery setting is total clamping time. Especially because the increase of LV pressure in CCP group, indicated as a possible cause of infarct area size enlargement, it could have been interesting to evaluate differences in groups in applying shorter clamping times. For an average revascularization procedure, usually no more than 60 minutes are required...

After having evaluated the already declared limitations, as in any experimental model, the study remains very interesting and worth to be accepted after a minor revision.
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