

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jovs-22-43>

Reviewer A

Comment 1: Van der Merwe and colleagues describe the initiation of a minimally invasive CABG program in their comprehensive review article. The references are timely and high-level, and the included figures will be very informative to the reader. Additionally, the authors do a tremendous job of covering all aspects of initiating a program from pre-op care to post-op recovery.

Reply 1: Thank you very much for your comment.

Comment 2: I am not personally fond of the acronym MISCAR. Prior authors have used MI-CABG or other variations that make more intuitive sense. I would advise the authors to change to an acronym that has been previously utilized and incorporate it throughout the manuscript.

Reply 2: Thank you very much for your comment and we incorporated MI-CABG as a preferred acronym through-out the manuscript.

Change 2: MISCAR was changed to MI-CABG throughout the manuscript

Comment 3: In the abstract and throughout the paper, there are multiple extremely long sentences - some bordering on run-on sentences. They may not be grammatically incorrect, but they make reading extremely difficult. Respectfully, I would ask the authors to review the writing and make it more varied throughout with a combination of sentence styles.

Reply 3: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We shortened various sentences and trust that you will find the changes satisfactory.

Comment 4: One of the things that should be emphasized in the paragraph under "Initial Patient Selection" is target vessel size. Patients with small distals should be avoided to start, and I would add that to Table 1.

Reply 4: Thank you very much for your comment. Target vessel size ≤ 1.0 mm was added to the table.

Comment 5: Under "Procedure conclusion and postoperative care", mention should be made about extubation in the OR.

Reply 5: Thank you very much for your suggestion. A new reference was added to the statement "Reports that describe the benefits associated with ultra-fast track- / in-theatre extubation are

progressively emerging with the intention of reducing hospitalization costs and to enhance postoperative recovery” in the relevant section.

Comment 6: I would eliminate the sentence regarding "Strengths and Limitations"

Reply 6: Thank you very much. The section was removed from the text.

Comment 7: Congratulations on a thorough review

Reply 7: It is our privilege to contribute.

Reviewer B

Comment 1: The current review is comprehensive and in-depth concerning minimal invasive coronary artery surgery. The manuscript is well written. The authors are to be congratulated for their work on this issue. My only concern is that the multiple extremely long (bordering on run-on) sentences make it extremely difficult to read. The English is good, but the writing style makes for difficult reading and should be altered throughout.

Reply 1: Thank you very much for your comment. The abstract and text were revised and we trust that you find these changes satisfactory.