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Author’s response to reviews:
Answers to Editor

1. Overlap in Methods

> We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:


> This overlap mainly exists in the Methods.

> While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work.

> Please re-phrase these sections to minimize overlap.
Additionally, if this study uses methodology from a previously published work, please provide a summarizing statement in the methodology together with a citation to the original paper.

We are very grateful to the reviewer for the comments. We do agree that some sentences, especially in the Methods section, overlap with our previously published articles. It is mostly because we used same imaging technique, as well as analysis software and methodology. There we decided to cite our previous paper. Moreover, we re-phrased as many as possible text within the manuscript.

2. Missing Keywords

> In your Abstract, please also include a keywords section, which should three to ten keywords. This should follow the Conclusions section.

We added Keywords in the Abstract after the Conclusions section.

3. Ethics approval and consent to participate

> In this section of the Declarations, please include the full name of the ethics committee (and the institute to which it belongs to) that approved the study and the committee’s reference number if appropriate.

As the study protocol was approved by the local ethics committee, we added its full name into Declarations section.
4. Consent for publication

> Currently, the statement in your “consent for publication” section of your declarations is incorrect. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

Stated as “Not Applicable”.

5. Competing interests

> In this section, please add the statements, ‘BS and CS are employees of Philips Healthcare,’ and ‘TL, SK, AS, 18 EPK and BP received support from the DZHK (German Centre for Cardiovascular Research).

Additional statements are included into “Competing interests” section.

6. Role of funding bodies

> In the Funding statement of the Declarations, please describe the role of the funding bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Additional information provided: “This study was not supported with specific funding that could influence study design or results”.
7. Authors’ contributions

> We would also like to ask for you to provide more justification for the contributions of LS, BS and KK, as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to carrying out experiments alone, does not usually justify authorship.

Contributions of the authors were detailed accordingly.

8. Clean manuscript

> At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colors. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Clean version prepared and uploaded as required.

Answers to Reviewer #1

1. The authors included baseline characteristics in the table 1 and revised their manuscript well. Also, they calculated ICC and mentioned about the value of ICC in the method section as 'Agreement was considered excellent for ICC <0.74, good for ICC 0.60–0.74, fair for ICC 0.40–0.59, and poor for ICC <0.40'. The authors should change 'ICC >0.74' instead of 'ICC<0.74'. Thank you for your revision.

Mistake removed. ICC <0.74 changed into ICC >0.74 (page 7, line 3).