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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions
The trial is well conducted and well written paper making it difficult to severely criticize. They address an important issue as IC (or PAD) is frequent and increasing in woman, in contrast to men. However, our way to research and make clinical judgements are based upon lessons learned from decades ago, where it was a male smokers disease. The paper shows IC in woman have different manifestations, and more severe consequences in psychological and social well being, than in men.

- Minor Essential Revisions
1. abstract: age range of the elderly subjects and definition of IC is missing. Similary, the relatively minor sample size for the cohort ought to be mentioned (N=56), The author can be trusted to make these.
2. Methods, page 5, line 20. This is not 81% of the population, but of the survivors. The true selection is 64%. It is bit a glorifying but proportions ought to be mentioned.
3. Methods, page 7, line 18-19. The sentence belongs to the section below?
4. Statistics, page 8, line 21-25. It is untraditional to choose non-parametric tests, but parametric descriptive statistics. If distributions are normally distributed, uni-and multivariate testing ought to be performed to adjust and localize confounders as for instance age and degree of disease.
5. Discussion, page 13, line 7-9. Is this sentence justified by the results and statistical testing?

- Discretionary Revisions
6. Methods, page 5, line 7-8. I had to read the sentence more times to get it right. It is 5080 attenders of 8000 asked/invited. Consider a more clear expression.
7. Methods, page 5, line 20. I don’t think all died in 2008?
8. Results, page 10, line 16. This reference is not used.
9. Discussion, I miss discussion of the methods to measure ABI and walking distance, as these are not as what is usually used (TASC recommendation and treadmill). In addition, I miss a discussion of the power in part B. For instance, no statistical difference in hsCRP could be shown in spite of almost a threefold
difference between the genders. Finally, I miss discussion of the lack of confounder adjustment

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.