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To the editor of Systematic reviews Journal

Thank you for reviewing our paper entitled “Magnetic Resonance Myocardial Perfusion Imaging in the Diagnosis of Functionally Significant Obstructive Coronary Artery Disease. A systematic review protocol”

Regarding the comments from the reviewer Mark Rogers we have made specific changes.

Major
1. The used of MetaDisc 1.4 to perform bivariate random effects meta-analyses
   Correspondance: We have analysed the capabilities of MetaDisc and we do agree, it is limited in calculating pooled sensitivities as well as accounting for the correlation between these measures, we have therefore nominated STATA 13 (with xtmelogit command) to be the used software in this systematic review. We also did not prefer to use two different softwares as this will be confusing indeed.

2. The use of bivariate random effects model and random effects model
   Correspondance. Thank you for pointing this out. Our intention is to use bivariate random effects model rather than just random effect model as we would like to account for the correlation of these measures between the studies. This had been clarified in the paper

Minor
1. Typographical
   We have corrected the suggested typographies and made more thorough proof-reading of the paper