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Reviewer’s report:

This study retrospectively evaluates the prevalence of anemia in patients with heart failure and its impact on prognosis.

The study is well performed and although limited to a single center and a selected population of few patients, their results are interesting.

It is unclear why asymptomatic patients were excluded from admission. It should be specified why patients in functional class II were not included. This could mean a greater number of patients included and therefore greater representativeness of the sample.

Establishing survival status from last hospital discharge or medication refill as a subrogant to establish survival time is not usual and implies a major limitation. This topic should be included limitations of the study.

In turn, it is better to express the follow-up time as median (IQR) than as mean ± SD.

The "Methods" section seems to incomplete (page 4)

In the Results section, it is shown that hemoglobin was statistically different between both groups, however, this should be in methodology since it was the criterion used to define the groups.

It is clearly observed that, although anemia is a significant risk marker, it is not an independent predictor of mortality. This should be emphasized both in the results and in the discussion and conclusions.

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.

No

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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