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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks for the opportunity to review this well described study and well written manuscript of a relevant, current clinical question. Although the power analysis is supportive and you have made appropriate and not over-stated conclusions and recommendations, the small study in context of the very heterogenous population (which you describe as clinically relevant) is noted.

Last sentence of methods: indeterminate or missing data? How many were there - can't tell from any of the results or tables?

Discussion, implications paragraph: .... role of thrombus ....

As you repeatedly point to the clinical relevance of the population and interchangeable results, I would consider adding a comment that although minor differences in some variables were detected (R 0.9 minutes, K 0.4 minutes, angle 1.7 degrees), all variables fell within acceptable normal limits, changes were likely clinically insignificant and even the apparent bias in MA (difference 5.2 mm which you did comment may affect decision making) and difference in LY 30 (0.61%) would not likely impact clinical decision-making if within normal limits. This will reassure readers and device users that statistically significant changes may not imply clinical concern.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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