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Author's response to reviews: see over
Answer to the reviewer Dr Patrick Meimoun:

We appreciate your valuable comments and provide the following explanations:

1) In the section Results, analysis of coronary flow reserve, the authors wrote: “the mean increase in CFR was 2.67” which is ambiguous and not correct because CFR is the final value of flow velocities. They should write the mean CFR or the mean CFR at the end of the dobutamina test.

*We appreciate the correction and have made the corresponding modifications as suggested by the reviewer.*

2) In the next sentence they wrote “heart” instead of heart rate.

*We appreciate the correction and have made the corresponding modifications as suggested by the reviewer.*

3) In the section Discussion, the author cited on page 13 is not “Maimun” but Meimoun. Please correct.

*We apologize for this involuntary mistake and have corrected it. We are grateful to the reviewer whose constructive comments helped us improve the manuscript.*
**Answer to the reviewer Dra Rosa Sicari:**

We appreciate your valuable comments and provide the following explanations:

1) The main issues that have not been addressed are related to: patient population characterization; study design and aims.

   We have thoroughly given more details about the characteristics of the study population and reformulated the objectives of the study for a better reading comprehension.

2) The statement that “a value of CFR<2 obtained below these limits should be considered inadequate”, does not make any sense. What is the purpose of measuring CFR, if it has be normal in all conditions. Maybe authors simply need to rephrase it.

   We agree with the reviewer that this statement may sound confusing. We are grateful to the reviewer for her correction.

3) Please revise extensively the English language.

   We have improved and corrected style and grammar issues of the manuscript.

4) Do not cite abstracts in the bibliography.

   We have eliminated reference 7 (abstract) as suggested by the reviewer.

   We are grateful to the reviewer whose constructive comments helped us improve the manuscript.