Reviewer’s report

Title: Clinical results of bioresorbable drug-eluting scaffolds in short and long coronary artery lesions using the PSP technique

Version: 0 Date: 25 Nov 2018

Reviewer: Gianluca Campo

Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript is well written and the methods adequate. The interest of the topic is limited due to well-known history of BVS and due to their lack on the market.

Nevertheless, scaffolds remain one of the most interesting evolution in the setting of coronary devices.

My major concern about the present manuscript is the lack of a "true" control arm

The Authors compare the outcomes of short vs long lesions treated with BVS. Then, the only possible conclusion is: long lesions show a higher occurrence of adverse events as compared to short lesions. This is a well-established issue and it is not related to scaffold implantation or not. In the present analysis is missing a control arm. The Authors can only describe the occurrence of adverse events, but they cannot give any information about higher or lower occurrence

The Authors tried to compare the rate of adverse events of their study population with that of previsuo studies. I appreciated this effort, but it is necessary to report a larger number of studies with long lesions (treated or not with BVS) to permit a more reliable comparison. For example, a Table should be interesting

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
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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