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**Reviewer’s report:**

This paper is a meta-analysis on coronary collaterals and risk for restenosis after percutaneous coronary interventions. The Authors have clearly stated in the "limitation of study" chapter, that it is very difficult to really understand the complexity of physiopathology of coronary circulation and its collaterals. Therefore, despite the paper is well written and the statistical analysis is correct, the Authors should shorten and modify the discussion, making it more focused and less hypothetical. In my opinion mostly the therapeutical indications that the Authors should be more attenuated, not being adequately supported by data. An other consideration is that this paper is more suitable for BMC Cardiovascular Disorders.

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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