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Response to raised issues

There are a few issues that remain unaddressed:

1. One of the referee requested the change of the angiographic cut-off and consistency with the Mydise study is not a sufficient reason to leave the data unmodified. So please reanalyze you data by changing the angiographic gold standard.

   All quantitative and WMSI data are reanalyzed changing the angiographic threshold to ≥70% stenosis (this is reflected in Methods section, Results, Table 3).

2. The comparison between quantitative and visual assessment should be compared. The accuracies should be reported for visual assessment.

   Comparison between quantitative and visual assessment is performed and presented in Results section (page 10) and Table 3. Accuracies for visual assessment are reported on page 10.

3. The inter and intra-observer variability should be reported also for visual assessment.

   Inter and intra-observer variability for visual assessment is reported in Table 2.