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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a well written paper, which tries to assess if catecholamines add to TTS mortality and morbidity.

It is difficult to come to a specific conclusion because we really dont know if Catecholamines increased mortality or patients who required catecholamies were on the worse end of TTS spectrum to start with. Hence, it does not answer the controversial question of catecholamine infusion in TTS increases mortality.

Now coming to few other things. The primary end point is different in the abstract from the main text. We need clarification what was you composite end point.

Secondly it will be helpful if you could please provide absolute numbers along with percentages when mentioning primary and secondary end points. Specifically in regards to all cause mortality for which you used the multivariate analysis. Also, please describe if the end point used in the multivarite analysis was allcause mortality as inpatient or 30 days.

Only after assessing how many events happened I would be able to comment if the multiple logistic regression was performed correctly.

Please describe in the methods sections on how you defined for cardiogenic shock, recurrence, and myocardial infarction, in your study.
It would be helpful to us if you could provide the cause/mode of death of the patients who died in hospital and what were the non-cardiac illnesses in case of secondary TTS.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**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 recommend additional statistical review

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