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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a meta-analysis of RCTs reporting clinical outcomes for the Absorb bioabsorbable scaffold and a comparable metallic DES. The authors found higher rates of TLF, stent thrombosis and cardiac death with the bioabsorbable scaffold compared to conventional DES.

The hypothesis is not novel and has been examined by others Zair et al. Circ 2018;137:464-479.

The article requires some grammatical and syntax correction. I struggled to understand the content of para 1 in the introduction. The discussion is far too short and should be expanded to discuss findings, limitations, and perhaps consider benefits/pitfalls of alternative absorbable scaffold strategies.

Although other bioabsorbable scaffolds exist on the market, none of the others have been tested in RCTs. The authors should make clear that the meta-analysis deals solely with the Absorb BVS, albeit different generations of scaffold.

The major limitation of this study is the omission of key trials performed within the time period, namely Absorb III (Ellis et al. N Engl J Med 2015; 373:1905-1915) and Absorb IV (Stone et al. The Lancet. 2018; 392;1530-1540). I am unclear why these were not included as they are by far the largest RCTs in this area. Together 2 trials these include over 4600 patients - almost 3 fold greater than those included in the current meta-analysis. Was there a methodological reason these trials were excluded?
It is very unlikely that any further RCTs with this product will ever be performed. I think by omitting the dominant trials in this area, it is difficult to interpret the findings of the current study.
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