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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Minor essential revisions

Abstract: The same sentence is used in the results and in the conclusion “The proportion of non-assessable stents was influenced by the number of detectors, stent diameter, strut thickness and the use of an edge-enhancing kernel.” This repetition should be avoided.

Background: There are more recent references on conventional angiography complications that should be added.

Discussion: -Page 9, first paragraph: The high variability of the proportion of non-assessable stents is mostly related to different methodologies used in previous studies. Therefore, this argument does not seem to be of high importance in the evaluation of the diagnostic performance of the technique. The authors should add an sentence explaining the reason of this high variability between the studies.

-Page 11, second paragraph: “An inherent limitation of stent evaluation with MDCTA is the lack of functional information, such as provided by nuclear and other perfusion techniques...Although direct correlation of the degree of ISR on MDCTA has not been formally evaluated with FFR, there is no proof that MDCTA would be superior or inferior than CA with or without quantitative analysis of the degree of stenosis.” The authors can not extrapolate the use of a pure functional technique (FFR) to a morphologic technique as MSCT. This part of the discussion is therefore highly questionable and should be suppressed.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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