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Reviewer's report:

Most of the points raised at the initial review have been addressed in some way. However, there still seems to me a lack of concluding statements. This may be addressed by having a short, focused conclusion paragraph, rather than meekly ending the whole article on limitations and need for more research.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. A concluding paragraph is required.
2. Incomplete or incorrectly formatted references (Overall format style incorrect, see also 28- no pages, some title abbreviated, some not) and several typos need editing (the abstract could do with a refinement)

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Methods: What is the point of the "medical history form"?
2. Methods, paragraph 2. Is there any prior evidence of the SmartDop 30EX being used in a study?
3. Background, paragraph 1, sentence 2. Can evidence be cited that supports this assertion?
4. Background, paragraph 2, sentence 2. can the "opportunity for revascularisation" be clarified for the stated context?
5. Background paragraph 2. I found myself asking "so what" to the information about the Romanos paper- does that paper report good reliability results, or does it raise concerns? What is the key point of the information given? This is not clear
6. Methods, paragraph 1. Table 1 is reporting results, not methods.
7. Discussion, paragraph 3: Is there any evidence to support the speculation about why the reliability was lower for brachial pressures?

Discretionary Revisions
1. Further definition of microvascular disease could be added

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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