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**Reviewer's report:**

Few comments to improve the manuscript:

- Please clarify the number of patients excluded according to the different exclusion criteria. The overall time of enrollment is very long, I think that the study population is highly selected.

- You enrol 80 patients from among 138 with stable CAD. Please clarify the reasons to exclude the other 58 patients.

- Please, clarify the experience of the team performing the FMD measurement. It is performed by only one technician and/or physician? Please clarify variability between observations.

- Several reports suggested that ACE inhibitors are able to modulate endothelial function. Especially, it has been observed a significant difference between A2R blockers and ACE-l. Similarly, some studies suggested a difference between ACE-Inhibitors (Am J Cardiovasc Drugs. 2011;11:189). Please clarify this issue. Please clarify the number of patients in ACE-l and in A2R blockers. Please, clarify the type of ACE-l.

- A similar consideration should be done for statins. Please clarify type and dose of statins.

- Endpoints: the composite endpoint is not usual? Why you include critical limb ischaemia? In addition the definition of all endpoints is missing. How you assess cardiac death? You include type 2 MI in you definition? You include type 4 MI in you definition? How you define stroke? Ischaemic stroke only or also intracranial haemorragic stroke?

- It was present a independent reviewer to assess adverse events? This reviewer was blinded to FMD measurements?

- You observed 19 adverse events due to new lesions. This is a very high number? Do you perform angiographic follow-up? Please clarify the clinical presentation. It is after stress test? It is for ACS? Nevertheless, you reported only one MI adverse event.

- Why you did not consider hospital admission for ACS in your endpoints?

- Discussion: endothelial function may be really important after BVS implantation. I well know that in your study population BVS are not implanted. Nevertheless, a sentence in the discussion may improve the interest in the paper.
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Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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