Review of: "Graft Angiography Through Right Radial Artery: A Retrospective Cohort Study"

Mehrbod Vakhshoori

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear editor in chief:

It is my pleasure to be selected as one of the reviewers of the manuscript named “Graft Angiography Through Right Radial Artery: A Retrospective Cohort Study”. Hashmi et al. performed a retrospective cohort study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of graft angiography through the right radial artery.

By the way, there are some major and minor comments that might be helpful for improving the quality of the article.

- It is better to also use medical subheading (MeSH) terms in keywords. “CABG” and “right radial access” are not MeSH terms.
- In the “data extraction” section, not all assessed comorbidities have been mentioned. Please add them.
- Although P<0.05 is mostly considered statistically significant in the literature, the authors did not mention it. It’s better to add the significance level.
- The authors used mean±SD or median with interquartile range for reporting continuous variables based on data distribution, but there is not any report of the data normality assessment in the results section. Also, it is better to name the test used for assessing normality.
- In the results section, it is better to sort the comorbidities from highest to lowest occurrence rate.
- In Table 1, I highly recommend doing complementary analysis to find any difference between cases and controls in terms of pre-defined variables with a report of P values.
- I think it’s better to be more specific about the definition of “nerve injury.”
- In Table 2, the authors performed univariate logistic regression models. Although they indicated this study used a simple statistical analysis, it is pivotal to perform multivariate logistic regression models to consider the effects of confounding variables and adjust them in order to find the exact likelihood of complications between groups.
- There is not any report regarding the time of graft angiography in the text. This is an important issue, especially if there is a remarkable difference between cases and controls.
- Please also elaborate on the methods of graft angiography in controls.
- In the discussion section, the authors indicated right radial artery angiography is associated with shorter hospital stays. If the authors have the related data, it would be better to also analyze this outcome between groups.
- In Table 1, the authors stated “other.” It is better to briefly describe it in the main text.
- In the limitations section, the authors indicated the baseline characteristics were not matched between cases and

controls. However, there was not any statistical test to prove it. If that's the case, the authors can use some statistical methods (like propensity score matching) to select matched cases and controls.

- Please also briefly explain the reasons for unsuccessful graft angiography among cases.
- Since the study is a retrospective cohort study, "relative risk" is a better statistical term than "odds ratio." Consulting with a statistician is recommended.

Regards