

Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/cdt-22-487>

Comment 1: The format of the text wraps around needs to correct.

Reply 1: Thank you for your helpful guidance. We have carefully edited the entire manuscript and revised the manuscript follow the required format. Thanks again!

Comment 2: Omit the “respectively” in the result; the sentence of the results must agree in tense.

Reply 2: Thank you for your professional comments. We have omitted the word “respectively” and revised the tense consistently in the Abstract section. Thanks again!

Changes in the text: The word “respectively” has been omitted (see Page 3, line 45). We have changed the wrong past tense into the present tense of the “Result” in this section (see Page 3, line 43, 45, 47).

Comment 3: The description of the method is not clear, add details that the stenosis was represented by scores.

Reply 3: Thank you for your professional comments. We have redescribed the method as “using the subjective quality grade” in this section. Thanks again to the reviewer for the professional suggestions.

Changes in the text: We have supplemented the detail of the method (see Page 2, line 34).

Comment 4: Regarding explaining the situation of CAD, what is the association between coronary artery stenosis and CAD? Please give the explanation.

Reply 4: Thank you for your professional comments. We have added the association between coronary artery stenosis and CAD in the Introduction section to explain why we mentioned the coronary artery stenosis, as follows: “... and becoming younger. Coronary artery stenosis is an important basis for imaging diagnosis of coronary heart disease.” Thanks again!

Changes in the text: We have supplemented the details of the “Introduction” (see Page 4, lines 65, 66).

Comment 5: The sentence “We did not ... stent implantation.” should appear in method, not introduction.

Reply 5: Thank you for your professional comments. We have moved the sentence “We did not ... stent implantation.” from this section to the first sentence in paragraph 5 of the method section. Thanks again to the reviewer for the professional suggestions.

Changes in the text: We have moved the sentence (see Page 8, lines 162, 163).

Comment 6: Please unify the description of “non-invasive” and “nonradiative”.

Reply 6: Thank you for your professional comments. We have changed the “nonradiative” into “non-radiative”. Thanks again to the reviewer for the professional suggestions.

Changes in the text: We have unified description (see Page 4, line 73).

Comment 7: It is necessary to specify the sample size in the first sentence of the study population, just like in the abstract.

Reply 7: Thank you for your professional comments. We have added the sample size in the first sentence of the study population in the Methods section as follows: “35 patients underwent NCE-CMRA from January 2021 to March 2022, of whom 29 had previously undergone CCTA. Besides, there are 9 patients who did not perform the scanning successfully. We recruited 44 patients from Yantai Yuhuangding hospital randomly in total.” Thanks again!

Changes in the text: We have supplemented the detail of study population (see Page 5, lines 94, 95, 96, 97).

Comment 8: The description of graph is too simple, please state more clearly.

Reply 8: Thank you for your professional comments. We have described the graphs in detail about examination, scan sequence, and reconstruction technique in each separate file of figures. Thanks again to the reviewer for the professional suggestions.

Comment 9: What is the meaning of “3- or 4- point”? The same description is recommended throughout the text.

Reply 9: Thank you for your professional comments. The 3- or 4- point means the score is 3 or 4. We have changed the description of “3- or 4- point” into “the score of 3 or 4” in total text. Thanks again to the reviewer for the professional suggestions.

Changes in the text: We have revised the description (see Page 7, 9, lines 144, 145, 180).

Comment 10: The sentence of the results must agree in tense, which may create confusion for the readers.

Reply 10: Thank you for your professional comments. We have changed the wrong past tense into the present tense in the Results section. Thanks again!

Changes in the text: We have corrected the tense (see Pages 9,10, lines 175, 183, 187, 188, 189, 192, 193, 194, 196).

Comment 11: Paragraph is lack of logic, please reorganize the discussion from beginning to the end and increase the content of the conversation around the results, this will illustrate and explain the results of the study better. Besides, there will be important reference value for the other researchers.

Reply 11: Thank you for your professional comments. We have reorganized the discussion and added the analysis of the results in the Discussion section. We have completed the advantages of our study and divided the methods of improving NCE-CMRA into improving image quality and reducing acquisition time. Besides, we have added some cohesive words and sentences to make this section more logical. Thanks again!

Changes in the text: We have adjusted the order of paragraphs and sentences to make the discussion more logical and added some description (see Pages 10-13, lines 199-267).

Comment 12: Please revise the grammar of the last sentence in limitations.

Reply 12: Thank you for your professional comments. We have corrected the grammar of the last sentence in the limitation. The modification is as follows: Some of the patients could not do it, especially the older patients.

Changes in the text: We have revised the sentence (see Page 13, lines 271, 272).