Reviewer’s report

Title: Two cases of granuloma mimicking local recurrence after pulmonary segmentectomy

Version: 0 Date: 27 Oct 2019

Reviewer: A El-Gamel

Reviewer's report:

I congratulate the authors for a good experiment that trying to highlight the efficacy of blood cardioplegia versus crystalloid CP. Some points in the methodology are not clear line 31 following the LAD occlusion 120 minutes, has the tie been removed prior to administration of cardioplegia as with the antegrade route there is no way the cardioplegia will reach the ischaemic area in fact to the the outcome of the experiment could not be explained by cardioplegic protection, has the tie been removed prior to administration of cardioplegia please clarify, clinically the retrograde plegia will be used in this circumstances this is an important step otherwise there is a doubt if cardioplegia has reached the ischaemic area.

Line 13 in the results section have confirmed the efficacy of both cardoplegic solution in a non-ischaemic myocardium the paradox in case of ischaemia could have been explained better if the cardioplegic solution have reached that ischaemic area as the difference in the in fact size may be caused by different anatomical Coronary circulation between this hearts, I think this is a very important point regarding the study to make the conclusion worthwhile otherwise it is a faulty logic to conclude that the difference we see at the end as related to the different protection provided cardioplegia please explain

To be impartial, conclusions and the discussion should be changed to allow a possibility that maybe the delivery of carioplegia was not adequate.
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