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Reviewer’s report:

This paper describes a well conducted/reported systematic review evaluating the risks and benefits of antiplatelet (APT) therapy in the perioperative period, how these risks and benefits vary by APT management, and the significance of length of time since stent implantation before operative intervention. Overall, the justification is clearly argued and convincing. The reporting and presentation of methods and results is complete and clear. The authors discuss data were too heterogeneous for statistical pooling (meta-analysis).

Minor comments:

1. The authors acknowledge this manuscript is a condensed version of a report prepared for the Veterans Affairs (VA) that is publicly available in reference 6. Could you please clarify if this VA report is cataloged in PubMed (available for free)? Perhaps, the authors should state in the Abstract/Methods (or Funding) section some of this (e.g. This article presents a condensed version of the report published by the Department of Veterans Affairs).

2. Page 6 line 137. Methods. The authors state: "The quality of cohort studies were evaluated based on design (retrospective versus prospective), representativeness of the enrolled subjects, balancing for sampling differences, follow-up rates, and statistical methods." Could you please clarify whether a specific risk of bias/quality assessment tool was used for epidemiological studies (including any reference)? Did you evaluate the quality of the case-control study(ies)?

3. Page 10 lines 239-244. Discussion. Perhaps the terms "strong signal of effect", and "lack of signal" could be reworded in line with the conclusion (e.g. Evidence regarding (…) is insufficient to guide clinical practice).
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