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Reviewer’s report:

Lacalzada-Almeida et al performed an interesting study on the role of strain echocardiography in patients with intertribal block. Due to the spreading of ablation procedure for supraventricular arrhythmias and to the need to ever better understand the physiological mechanism underlying them, I think that this paper could be of interest for the journal readers after some minor changes. On the whole, it is a very nice job.

In the first part of the paper, where the authors talk about atrial anatomy and the role of Bachmann bundle, a reference should be added regarding atrial anatomy (see for example: Anatomy of the atria : A road map to the left atrial appendage. Herzschrittmacherther Elektrophysiol. 2017 Dec;28(4):347-354).

The role of atrial volume as a risk factor for atrial arrhythmias has been evaluated and demonstrated using CMR in patients who can act like clear examples because of their extreme dilated atria like the patients with Ebstein anomaly (see Rydman R et al. Major adverse events and atrial tachycardia in Ebstein's anomaly predicted by cardiovascular magnetic resonance. Heart. 2018 Jan;104(1):37-44.)Since the authors talk about the CMR role in predicting atrial arrhythmias, recent and high IF citation like the one I mention above should be added in the references section.

Page 14 line 18, maybe delayed gadolinium enhancement is not so clear, better use the LGE (late gadolinium enhancement) form.
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