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Reviewer's report:

Rockley et al., propose a protocol for a systematic review on prolonged balloon inflation for arterial angioplasty which is a fundamental treatment for atherosclerotic disease in the cardiac, cerebrovascular, and peripheral vasculature since its first use in 1977. The study aims to investigate whether an angioplasty balloon inflation of at least a minute duration, when compared with less than a minute balloon inflation, affects residual stenosis after arterial angioplasty, with an ultimate intention to synthesize the evidence and guide future clinical decision making and investigation.

The protocol is well thought-out with a clear objective, thorough methods and overall well written manuscript.

I have following comment to the authors,

Background:

- Page 3, 2nd paragraph,

- The authors wrote ‘Various techniques have been proposed to minimize restenosis following angioplasty, however many have not been thoroughly evaluated in randomized trials. One such technique is prolonged angioplasty balloon inflation time, which is theorized to reduce post-interventional dissection and induce smooth muscle dysfunction, thereby reducing vasospasm and resulting stenosis. Is there is any prior literature on this? Can authors provide a reference?
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