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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor!

We have carefully tried to adjust our manuscript in accordance with the requests made by the reviewers.

The following major revisions have been made:

1) The reviewer pointed out that CCS class is still presented as continuous data rather than ordinal data.

We understand this statistical concern, but have nevertheless chosen to keep the presentation of reduction in CCS class after treatment as mean +/- SEM along with a more appropriate presentation of CCS class as ordinal data, since it is easy to grasp. As we pointed out, this approach is common in biomedical literature, especially when dealing with pain estimation. We added a short note about the statistical concern in the “limitations of the study” section to further clarify this.

2) The reviewer requested information on the number of patients at each follow-up interval.

We have done as suggested by the reviewer. The actual number of patients are now presented in figures 1 and 2a-c.

3) The reviewer had a hard time finding any new information not already presented either in an American or British study.

We basically agree with the reviewer – this study contains few new finds. It is, however, important to provide confirmatory studies when dealing with new treatment approaches such as EECP. This study also provides the first long time follow-up of patients treated with EECP in Scandinavia and thus has its place in the literature.
We hope the changes made to the manuscript have addressed most of the concerns pointed out by the reviewer(s).

Best regards,

André Erdling, MD