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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is well written, easy to follow and interesting. It assesses the difference in circumferential and radial strain between patients with HCM and normal subjects. Moreover, it examines the difference of the above parameters between the myocardial LV layers. Although it is interesting, there are some revisions needed.

1. The results would be rewritten in a simpler and more understandable way. The repetition of the phrase "there was a significant difference, the absolute values were lower" is unnecessary. It could be rephrased simply as "the strain absolute values are significantly lower"

2. The discussion section repeats the results in the first paragraph.

3. The discussion section neither justifies the results of the study adequately nor uses adequate references. For example, in the twist parameters reported, the mid myocardial level follows the base both in HCM and normal patients. However, in normal subjects mid myocardial level follows the apex (1, 2). Moreover, the pathophysiology of the different strain values between HCM and normal subjects should be explained thoroughly in order to draw valuable conclusions about the mechanics of the diseased myocardium.

4. Is there a clinical implication of the study?


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.
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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