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Reviewer’s report:

Authors show the follow up results of 326 patients treated with BVS stratifying them according to lesion length. Kaplan-Meier estimates for DOCE showed higher incidence of DOCE in patients with long vs those with short lesions at 36 months.

I have several concerns regarding the present paper:

1. It is the umpteenth comparison between short and long lesions treated with BVS and this is simply wrong in the design. If you want to assess the outcome of patients with long lesion treated with BVS you should at least perform a propensity matched comparison with comparable patients treated with DES who should have been the right "control arm".

2. How can you compare two groups of which one has:
   
   --> +31% incidence of diabetes;
   
   --> +28% smokers;
   
   --> +72% of renal impairment;
   
   --> +38% of LAD lesions?
   
3. Conclusions are not supported by the results of the study. All the manuscript is based on a (wrong) comparison between short and long lesions. In the conclusion, I surprisingly read that "In long lesions compared to short ones the bioresorbable scaffold Absorb shows good clinical follow-up results up to 36 months with the proper PSP-technique". How is it possible to draw such a conclusion from the presented data?

4. Any comment related to the scaffold thrombosis rate (i.e.: "no higher scaffold thrombosis rate could be seen") is not correct due to the number of patients enrolled.
It should be acknowledged that the authors are not the firsts trying this comparison. They have illustrious predecessors (JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2017 Mar 27;10(6):560-568), but, as I wrote to my Italian colleagues (JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2017 Jun 26;10(12):1274-1275), I have still relevant concerns regarding such comparisons.

**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.

No

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

No

**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**
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