The manuscript is well written and give another perspective to CABG and PCI contemporary results.

It could be interesting to add a few words describing the current use of stents (newer or older) in the reported papers for the analysis. In other words, is this analysis is looking at current technology or where PCI performed with an older (ancient) technology?

It appears important to state the type of technology used because the major criticism that will come is that PCI is no longer done with the type of stents that were used in these experiences and summarized in the present paper.

Criteria of selection of studies included in the meta-analysis need to be clearly explained. Did the authors reject articles only on the title as stated in figure 1 ?

Criteria to assess quality of the articles included in the analysis should be explained and results of a quality analysis given to readers.

Should results of the homogeneity tests and of the file drawer effect be given in the results section?

Could it be possible to add an analysis of the difference in survival rates at specified intervals (yearly after interventions) ? Can you analyse more information than only survival, ie. stroke rates, reintervention rates?

A description of the types of stents used and of the CABG surgical characteristics (ie. on pump or off pump) could be shown in a stable.

In figure 2, results of the present analysis (HR) should be emphasized.

Stating that results more than one year after the interventions is a result at 'long term' could give false indication to readers. Could it be better to state result at mid-term??
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