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Reviewer's report:

General

We appreciate the authors addressing our concerns in their revised manuscript. We no longer have any major concerns but do suggest some modest changes to the Abstract.

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

None.

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

I would suggest that the authors re-word the conclusion of their abstract. The material is fine but it just appears unwieldy (and too much) for an abstract. A more succinct way of expressing their findings would be:

1. Changing the Conclusion to: "Increasing EBCT scores indicate higher risk for CAD in both asymptomatic and symptomatic patients suggesting a limited role for its use in decisions about coronary angiography, but this requires further study." The authors are probably able to come up with something better.

2. Avoiding the term "preventive interventions". I know that they mean medical therapy and risk factor modification, but in the post-COURAGE era this term inappropriately implies PCI.

3. Removing the term "enthusiastically" from the Background.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None.

Which journal?: Appropriate or potentially appropriate for BMC Medicine: an article of importance in its field
What next?: Accept for publication in BMC Medicine after minor essential revisions

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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