Reviewer’s report

Title: Modified balloon-stent kissing technique avoid side-branch compromise for simple true bifurcation lesions

Version: 0 Date: 27 Sep 2018

Reviewer: Kenji Sakata

Reviewer's report:

Comments to the Author
The manuscript entitled "Balloon-stent kissing technique avoid side-branch compromise for simple true bifurcation lesions" was reviewed. The concept of this study is interesting and important for therapeutic strategy of coronary bifurcation lesions, however, there are several issues that the authors should address as indicated in the Specific Comments.

Specific Comment:
In Table 3, the authors described that the incidence of immediate SB deterioration was significantly lower in BSKT than PS. This statistical significance between the two groups was mainly due to the difference in SB ostial pinching≥90% by angiography. Previous studies suggested that angiographic visual assessment of jailed SB lesions tended to overestimate the severity of jailed SB lesions compared to functional assessment by FFR (J Am Coll Cardiol, 46 (2005), pp. 633-637, J Am Coll Cardiol Intv, 5 (2012), pp. 155-161, J Am Coll Cardiol Intv, 5 (2012), pp. 409-415, Eur Heart J, 29 (2008), pp. 726-732). Therefore, because most of angiographic significant stenosis might not show functional ischemia, the difference between long-term clinical outcomes did not differ between patients treated with BSKT and PS at 12 months. The authors should discuss about this issue.

Minor comment:
In table 3, "Main-vessel TIMI flow≥3 after procedure" means "Main-vessel TIMI flow 3 after procedure"?

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.

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Acceptable
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