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Dear Chief Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the reviewers concerns and resubmit this paper for your consideration.

We appreciate the diligence and the suggestions received from both reviewers.

In response to Reviewer 1:
1) We agree that the paper’s title will be clearer if it would read: “Coronary artery calcium findings in asymptomatic subjects with family history of premature coronary artery disease”. Thus, we’ve made this the new title of our paper.
2) A direct comparison between CAC score and other diagnostic tests (e.g. stress test) used to aid the clinical decision making process in patients with intermediate risk for cardiovascular disease is a worthy idea. However, we would like to highlight that the focus of our paper was to assess frequencies of CAC findings in asymptomatic first degree relatives compared to controls.
3) In our study, subjects under the age of 25, pregnant women, and women of child bearing age that could have been pregnant at the time of the scan were excluded. This is a recruitment bias that we have acknowledged. See the third paragraph of the method section. Similar exclusion criteria, eliminating very low risk individuals, applied to controls and in a case-control study such as ours, the selection bias effect cancels out at the time of analysis.
4) We are committed to this group and follow up is in the process of being arranged at 5 and 10 years respectively. We cannot make any inference about the predictive value of the CAC score at this time.

In response to Reviewer 2:
We are grateful for the kind words of appreciation regarding our discussion section. We agree that the biochemical profile for the controls would have been desirable to present and compare with that of FDRs. The biochemical profile for FDRs was in the normal range and we expect that the results for the controls, represented by over 600 asymptomatic subjects, would not have been any different.

Again, thank you for considering publication of this manuscript!

Best regards,
Catalin Taraboanta