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Reviewer's report:

Major essential revisions

Under 'Outcomes' the authors refer to "the diagnostic accuracy of CMR for detection of functionally significant obstructive CAD" separately from the diagnostic accuracy of CMR relative to FFR. What other reference standard will they use to define "functionally significant obstructive CAD" in the absence of FFR? And if there is another reference standard, should the search be expanded beyond its current restriction to studies including FFR?

It might benefit readers if the authors stated a reason for choosing FFR thresholds of 0.75 and 0.80.

Minor essential revisions

The manuscript would benefit from close proofreading. Frequently, there inconsistent or inappropriate use of plurals and capitalisation, inconsistent use of abbreviations and occasional repetition of information. The words 'trial', 'report', 'study' and 'review' need to be used appropriately throughout.

It might also benefit from input from a statistician or someone with experience in systematic reviews of diagnostic accuracy to help with the overall coherence across the different sections of the protocol.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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