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Reviewer's report:

The authors have performed an interesting analysis of reports comparing prediction when adding calcium measures to Framingham Risk models.

Comments

1) One important factor in addition to the variables included in the Framingham model is whether the model coefficients were re-estimated in the new population or the published coefficients or point based model was used. This could have a large impact on the baseline AUC and would be worth adding to the paper.

2) Another important question is the outcomes used in the paper. There has been much discussion of CHD vs CVD and which models can be applied to what. This would also be worth noting.

3) I am not sure why the authors reference the cancer literature on publication bias. This may play into a larger issue where it might be helpful for the authors to separate conclusion about the predictive value of calcium and conclusions about how prediction results should be reported in the literature. This could be helped by separating the key points and the findings.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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