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Reviewer's report:

In this meta-analysis the authors reviewed the recent RCTs comparing provisional stenting vs crush technique for bifurcation lesions.

They concluded that the crushing technique is superior, since it is associated with less MACEs and need for revasc, however the hard clinical endpoints are similar with both methods.

This analysis is fair and includes six RCTs. The results are well presented and the paper length is appropriate.

Yet several issues have to be addressed:

Major comments:

1. The authors should mention why the CACTUS trial, the DEFINITION Study and the TRYTON Study were not included in their analysis. Was the design of the studies, the type of stents, the cohorts or other reasons?
2. It is essential to try to explain why in some studies the effect of double stenting might be associated with more MACEs.
3. In the limitations section the authors mentioned "other meta-analyses". Please clarify or add comparison with other analyses.
4. In the conclusions please add at the end "...stenting technique, but no change in all-cause mortality, myocardial infarction, cardiac death and stent thrombosis."
Minor comments:

1. In T. 2, one study was not graded, please explain why.
2. In p. 8, on baseline features, please do not repeat information given in T.3.
3. In p. 10 about the CACTUS trial, I think it would be better to write "....would be effective, but would also...", and "...on the side branch in one third of patients...".
4. In T.3 some alignment of columns should be done.
5. The authors might consider to add the paper by Behan et al, EHJ 2016.37, 1923, reporting lower 5 y. mortality with provisional stenting.

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.

Unable to assess

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
Declaration of competing interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal