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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

thank you for the consideration of our manuscript, please find a point by point answer to the reviewer’s concerns below.

On behalf of the authors,
Tobias Penzkofer

Abstract:
>Purpose: Modify the word “standard” to retrospective.
The statement was changed accordingly.

Title:
>For the Title i would suggest to drop “prospectively ECG-triggered high-pitch CT”
>since 2 different cardiac CT protocols were applied and instead include the term>
>“phantom study” and the scanner used.
The title was changed accordingly.

Discussion:
>The radiation exposure of up to 30 mSv in the 1st paragraph which was cited
>from a review paper (Ref. 8) was the result of a multicenter studies focused not
>only on the coronary CT examination but involved assessment of the CABG and
>chest pain triple rule out protocol for combined visualization of pulmonary arteries
and thoracic aorta. It was not due to substantial oversampling alone but in this case other factors like range of examination, etc. Please rewrite.
The statement was rewritten to address this concern.

4th Paragraph: Why use the term “exclusion” criteria? Patients with a heart rate of < 60 bpm had diagnostic image quality in all coronary segments with prospective ECG-triggered high pitch cardiac CT.
Thank you for the comment, the statement was changed.

Cite other published studies by Alkadhi H where ways of dose lowering in cardiac CT were addressed.
Additional works from the group were added to the article.