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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript is well-written and contains almost all of the items necessary in a protocol. I have just a few mostly minor questions/comments:

a) On page 4, at the end of the first paragraph, there is mention of the need for new options. The reference given is now 13 years old. A newer reference would be useful.

b) Although the Trial Status on page 16 indicates that the participant accrual is ongoing (as does the last paragraph on page 6), the last paragraph on page 7 uses verbs in the past tense, suggesting that accrual is complete. This should be clarified.

c) The Abstract indicates that the primary outcome of angina improvement is at 6 months, but the time for the primary outcome is not indicated in either the Outcomes section (page 9) or Table 2. It would be useful to include the time in those places as well as the Abstract.

d) A statement of possible conflicts of interest of the authors should be included.

e) The three tables are in the Supplementary Files. Although readily retrievable, they are important enough to be included with the main manuscript.

f) A trivial issue: references 6, 7, 9, and 10 have the author names all in upper case, which is different from the rest of the references.
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