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Dear Mr. Tacbobo,

Thank you very much for your letter and advice. We have revised the paper, and would like to re-submit it for your consideration. We have addressed the comments raised by the reviewers. This manuscript has been edited and proofread by Medjaden Bioscience Limited. Point-by-point responses are provided below.

Your consideration for this manuscript is highly appreciated.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Li T

Corresponding author
Cardiac Center, Third Central Hospital of Tian Jin, Tian Jin 300170, China
Tel.: +86-02284112130
Fax: +86-02284112130
E-mail: litong3zx@sina.com

Response to Reviewer Comments

Reviewer 1:

MAJOR REVISIONS:

1. In methods' section, please omit the sentence "coronary angiography was
performed WITHIN ONE MONTH AFTER STEMI”. According all countries’ guidelines, STEMI patient should undergo URGENT coronary angiography and percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). if not, give a valid explanation to this sentence.

Response: We agree with the reviewer that urgent PCI should be performed in patients with STEMI and ischemic symptoms of less than a 12-hour duration. However, some patients with STEMI are admitted to the hospital after this time, and therefore miss the emergency PCI therapy time window. In fact, there were a few patients with STEMI admitted to our hospital more than 10 days after symptom onset. Therefore, we have amended the corresponding statement as “due to delays for hospital admittance in some patients, coronary angiography was performed within one month after STEMI.”

2. Regarding discussion section, please try to simplify this section (too extensive) and to reduce number of references.

Response: According to the reviewer’s advice, we have simplified the discussion section and eliminated several references.

3. Shortly try to explain in the discussion section the similarity in troponin values between young and old STEMI patients.

Response: We appreciate the suggestion, and have added the relevant analysis in the section concerning study limitations.

4. Add in the study limitations that no data were collected about coronary angiography and coronary artery disease extension (1,2,3 vessels) and/or single vessel/multivessel PCI

Response: We have revised study limitations to include the fact that no data were collected regarding coronary artery disease extension.

MINOR REVISION:
1. Please specify also in method section that is a retrospective study.

Response: We have added the description of a retrospective study in the methods section.

2. Please correct spelling of reference 5

Response: We have corrected spelling of reference 5.

3. Further revise English mother tongue

Response: The revised manuscript has been proofread and edited by AmEditor Inc.

Reviewer 2:
1. Results, logistic regression: the authors defined "STEMI" as categorical variable, but probably meant that this was the "dependent" variable in the model. I suggest using the term "dependent" instead of "categorical", because categorical variables may also be used as independent variables.
Response: We appreciate the careful review and have revised the reference to STEMI as a dependent rather than a categorical variable.

2. Discussion: in my personal opinion, the discussion is far too long. I suggest focusing a little bit, but also to include relevant publications in the field (e.g., Schoenenberger AW et al. Int J Cardiol 2011;148:300)

Response: We thank the reviewer for the suggestion and have therefore simplified the discussion section and added the relevant reference.