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Reviewer’s report:

1. The authors conclusion about the healing profile of Synergy DES compared to BVS is of concern. The incidence of uncovered struts remains the main predictor of stent thrombosis, and in this study Absorb BVS showed better arterial healing than DES in terms of strut coverage and apposition.

2. Mean diameter of implanted stents significantly differed between study groups. In this case all the statistical analysis of quantitative OCT findings both at baseline and 3-month follow-up seems to be biased as well as the summary, based on this analysis. This could be the crucial limitation of this study and it can be recommended to perform propensity score matching or other actions to even the groups in terms of stent diameter.
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