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December 23rd, 2012

Dear Editor,

On behalf of all authors, I would like to extend my thanks to you and the Trials reviewers for your detailed and comprehensive comments. Your prompt and valuable feedback was well taken, and we have modified our manuscript accordingly. Please find the attached new revision for your inspection and our response to the reviewers comments below.

We carefully took into account your recommendations and suggestions, and believe that our new revisions greatly strengthen the manuscript.

We hope it meets the standards of your journal and thank you again for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Moo-Hyun Kim, MD, FACC
Professor, Corresponding author
Department of Cardiology, College of Medicine, Dong-A University Hospital
3-1, Dongdaesin-Dong, Seo-Gu, Busan, Republic of Korea 602-715
Tel: +82-51-240-2976, Fax: +82-51-255-2177
kimmh@dau.ac.kr
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Title: Comparison of Prasugrel and Clopidogrel Reloading on High Platelet Reactivity in Clopidogrel-loaded Patients Undergoing Percutaneous Coronary Intervention (PRAISE-HPR): a study protocol for a prospective randomized controlled clinical trial

Version: 1 Date: 28 November 2012

Reviewer: Jose M Arnau

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1-Abstract. The specific hypothesis of the study must be included and the primary outcome clearly specified.
   - Thank you for your valuable comments. We described the hypothesis and clearly specified the primary outcome of our study in the abstract.

2-Methods and design. The information about sample size calculation is incomplete. The assumed response rate in control group (clopidogrel) must be included.
   - We agreed with your opinion and have added the calculation of sample size in detail including the assumed response rate on the control group in the article.

Minor Essential Revisions

3-An additional review of minor spelling mistakes.
   - We apologize for the inconvenience. We asked skilled authors of native English language papers to check for improved readability. The appropriate corrections have been made and we double checked for spelling mistakes.

Discretionary Revisions

4-It would be interesting to specify if there is a well defined period of time to meet the inclusion criteria of "planned PCI".
   - We agree and have defined the time for “planned PCI” in the article.

5-It would be interesting to specify the time limit to perform the assessment of Platelet Reactivity before PCI.
   - Thank you for the useful comment. We specified the time limit for assessment of Platelet Reactivity before PCI. Additionally, we defined the time limit regarding administration of the study drug and
beginning of coronary angiography.

6-It would be interesting to specify the number of visits after discharge (and its schedule).

We appreciate your suggestion and have included the time and number of visits after discharge in the article.

External editor comments

1) distinguish between "withdrawal from the study" and "withdrawal from the treatment" (see http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMsr1203730);

- Thank you for the valuable suggestion and we absolutely agree with your suggestion. We have updated our protocol to make these distinctions and the data will be recorded. We have updated the relevant section with this information in the revised paper.

2) address in the discussion if this unmasked design is protected against performance bias and evaluation bias.

- Thank you for your comment. We have added information on the double-blind design of drug administration and data analysis in the discussion section.