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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper. The manuscript is well structured and written, the methods are thoroughly described and the statistical methods seem appropriate.

The work, however, contains some important limitations that affect the strength of the data presented.

1. Sample size is too small; furthermore the study group and the control group are too different. The control group should consists of elements that present the same characteristics of the study group, except for the variable applied to the latter. In this work the control group is completely different from the study group, so it can not be considered as a control group.

2. The authors stated that the differences in strain and strain rate parameters remained significant after adjustment for heart rate, blood pressure, LVEF, and body mass index in a multivariate model, but the presence of left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH) is not specified despite the high presence of hypertension in the study group. This is a fundamental factor because LVH is associated with impaired myocardial strain and may be responsible for itself for lower values of myocardial deformation parameters described in the study, independently of the presence of CAD.

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.
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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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