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Author’s response to reviews:

Please find appended our revised manuscript 4047458494411704, Progression of Coronary Calcification in Healthy Postmenopausal Women. In response to reviewers' comments we've made the following modifications:

Reviewer 1:
1. As noted, it would have been preferable to use volumetric scoring, which was not in widespread use at the time of our baseline scans. The company performing the scans changed hands 3 times between the baseline and follow up scans, so we do not have access to the original data and are unable to reanalyze the baseline scans to obtain volumetric scores. As requested, we've included this as a limitation of the study in the Discussion section, noting the potential failure to identify retraction of areas of calcification.
2. We also added a statement about the reason for mailing twice to African-American women, which was a historically lower response rate.

Reviewer 2:
1. Sample size limitation added to Discussion.
3. Baseline calcium scores by for white vs African-American women have been added to Results.
4. Annual change in calcium score is shown for African-American and white women:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertile</th>
<th>African-Am Mean (SD)</th>
<th>White Mean (SD)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+5 (12)</td>
<td>+14 (18)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+46 (43)</td>
<td>+23 (18)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+57 (43)</td>
<td>+90 (115)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings have been added to Results.
5. Medication inventory was performed at baseline and year 3 only. Women had their scans at different times in relation to these snapshots of medication use, so we can’t analyze statin use during the interval between scans.
6. Suggested editorial change in abstract has been made.

The manuscript has been checked against the formatting checklist. Thank you for considering our revised manuscript. Please let me know if I can be of further help.