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Reviewer's report:

This is a paper about the 'left ventricular diastolic impairment' (DI) is promoted to its title to deal about the topic from the surgeons’ perspective.

Major Compulsory Revisions

The paper is written more likely with a book chapter format rather than a review or an editorial article. It is too extensive and rearrangement of some paragraphs from one to another thematic unit has to be made, such as 'revascularization of … interstitial oedema’ could be moved from introduction to the discussion session, or the sentences ‘according to… dysfunction’ and ‘the presence of … LVDD/RVDD’ could be moved from the management to the results session. There are some sentences that can be omitted, such as relation of serca to hypothyroidism, number of factors that influence deceleration time, transmitral flow patterns in the diagnosis session etc, which do not add anything to the actual goal of the paper.

Integrated algorithm of the pathophysiology session has no legend and it is rather misleading. Table 1 is the only text under the literature review session, but it has no conclusions to the relevant column to most of the quoted papers. The high risk groups are in a table format and they should be integrated to text.

The actual results – outcome from literature review constitute a table with only 5 papers! Since there are many more papers into the discussion session their results should be presented there.

There is no clear message of the diagnosis of DI in the cardiothoracic setting; is there a different tool or algorithm from the cardiology setting? Moreover, the whole session is rather unnecessary.

There is no solid conclusion to the paper, hence, no suggestion except of exhortation to the surgeon to be careful and manage the underlie aetiology.

Uniformity of the references and check of their accuracy (i.e. ref. no 46 does not correspond to the text) should be made.

There is no result of how many articles did the authors find about their topic from the literature search, but these are randomly quoted in different sessions of the paper.

Results from the literature review are not clear and also not well commented.

Treatment session deals mainly with cardiology regime and not from surgeons’
point of view as it claims.

The question to the title whether DI is of minimal importance or an actual ‘Trojan horse’ is inappropriate. ‘Trojan horse’ is a virus that can affect any PC software and literally destroy it. There is no actual explanation to the text why DI could be considered as a virus of the heart. On the other hand since DI is a well described pathology of the heart why should someone name it as an infection or as an unknown invasion?

Improvement of written English is needed, i.e. the word ‘prospective’ to the title should change with the word ‘perspective’.

The abstract has to be rewritten since there are no results and no conclusion to it.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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