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Dear Editor,
Please find enclosed the revised version of our manuscript. We have incorporated all the suggestions by the reviewers and hope that the current version meets the criteria for publication in Cardiovascular Ultrasound. Below, we have listed the specific answers.
Yours sincerely,
Christoph Melzer, MD

To reviewer 1:

1. Other standard echocardiographic parameters (duration of E and A mitral waves ….) should be indicated.

These parameters are not necessary for Ritter’s method. For greater simplicity and clarity, we therefore feel that they should not be included in the study. Irrespective of this aspect, the changes in the stated parameters, as a function of the programmed AV interval, have been well known for many years (see references 6 and 7).

2. In the era of CRT is justified dual-chamber pacing in patients with severe left ventricular systolic dysfunction?

We have addressed this issue, especially at the end of the Introduction section.

3. The method of Ritter and Fig. 1 should be clarified.

We have completely revised our elaboration of Ritter’s method. We hope that it is now more readily understandable.


In the original version, we cited a study from 1989 on the same topic from the same team (see reference 6). In the present version, we have likewise included reference to the source you have cited (see reference 7).

5. Page 4 line 8 and page 7 line 6 is every and not evry.

Corrected.

6. Is this method validated just in an abstract?

This method was only published as an abstract. Despite this fact, this method is widely used in clinical practice.

7. RNV should be defined in the methods.

RNV is defined in the methods.
To reviewer 2:

1. **Patients’ selection should be detailed.**
   
   We have revised Tables 1 and 2 according to your wishes.

2. **Statistical analysis and results presentation.**
   
   We have revised the presentation of the Results sections in accordance with your wishes.

3. **Discussion**
   
   We have revised the Discussion section in line with your wishes.

4. **References should be updated: Ritter Europace 2004.**
   
   See reference 20.