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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editors and reviewers:

Thank you very much for your attention and suggestions. We found the comments are very helpful and we have carefully revised the manuscript. Here are the responses to the comments. The reviewer’s suggestions and questions are marked in red, and the answers are marked in blue.

Reviewer 1: Mathias Grebe

Thank you very much for your good suggestions. Your suggestions and questions and our answers are as follows:

Q: there are some contradicting statements in the article (e.g. "that most diabetic patients exhibited multiple types of plaques, especially calcified plaques" and "whereas no statistical differences were observed between diabetic and non-diabetic patients with respect to non-calcified and calcified plaques, (Fig 2, Table 2)") which should be clarified.

A: Yes, this express is not so accurate, so we have deleted “and that most diabetic patients exhibited multiple types of plaques, especially calcified plaques, a phenomenon that correlated with age, a long duration of diabetes and 2 or more accompanying risk factors”. We have checked throughout the paper to make sure no such mistakes again.

Q: It should be stated that conventional DSA in contrast to CTA offers the advantage of interventional treatement.

A: We have added this advantage of conventional DSA in Line 52 of “Back Ground”

This is the end. Thank you very much.
Reviewer 2: Jorge Escobedo

Q: However, there are some concerns regarding the source population that preclude its publication. It seems that this is a case series, and no comparison thus could be performed. The authors should clearly state how sampling was conducted.

A: We have explained the exact statistics methods "Statistical methods" part.

Q: While the authors mentioned that they used chi square for analysis in table 2, it is not clear why they present a p value for each level of categories (i.e. plaque type, grade of stenosis or plaque shape). A unique p value from each category should be obtained, although a chi square test for trend could also be obtained.

A: We have corrected this problem, and done the analysis again.

Q: In table 2, the first p value should rather be expressed as p<0.001.

A: We have changed the expression according to your comment.

Q: In table 1, some variables clearly have not a normal distribution and non-parametric tests should rather be employed.

A: We have tested the normality of the distribution, and continuous variables were compared using Student's t-test for unpaired data or the Mann-Whitney two-sample statistic as appropriate.

This is the end. Thank you very much.