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Reviewer's report:

Thank you so much for the opportunity for reviewing this manuscript SYSR-D-18-00363

First of all, this is a well-written manuscript that provide an systematic process of thought about this particular intervention. however, the title of manuscript does not follow with PICO guideline and would bring about a confusion which category of the patient problem would be addressed by this work. As such, I would recommend the author to revise the title of the manuscript. For an example, angioplasty is too general terms to define the procedure as different vascular territory intervention yield substantial result and long term prognosis. Also, type of balloon, saying that coated or uncoated, would definitely affect the result by angioplasty. This more specific scope would let the interventionist fully adopt the protocol to do further study. Based on the fact that interventional angioplasty result depends on multifactorial factors, one of them, other than operator experience, is device or tools that facilitate the procedure. This equipment has been continued developed and this factor should be included in this protocol.

Please provide brief explanation while a duration of 1 minuted has been employed as the cut-off value for the study group of prolonged angioplasty. There should be some prior evidence of irreversible damage in any component of vascular wall that make the difference compared to those with shorted balloon angioplasty.
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