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**Reviewer's report:**

This paper aims to corroborate diagnostic imaging equivalence between the Ocelot and the Dragonfly OCT systems with regards to the intravascular features that are most important in clinical management of patients with atherosclerotic vascular disease. The study demonstrates equivalence of image acquisition and consistent physician interpretation of images acquired by the Ocelot and the Dragonfly OCT systems. This paper is well-organized, the idea is interesting. The methodology is sound. However, the novelty is not strong and it also suffers from some minor errors.

1. **Major Compulsory Revisions**
   Although the methodology part is clear and sound, the contribution is not enough.

2. **Minor Essential Revisions**
   a. Page 4, line 18 and 19, some ??
   b. Legend of Figure 7 and Figure 8 appeared twice.
   c. Cannot see the questions in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8.

3. **Discretionary Revisions**

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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