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Dear Authors,

Manuscript Number BCAR-D-18-00848 entitled "Dysglycemia and increased left ventricle mass in normotensive patients admitted with a first myocardial infarction" has been reviewed.

First of all I want to thank the writers of this article for their planning and performed such an important study. I would like to congratulate for your work. The study and methodology of the study is well-designed. Results are consistent with the literature. I think that the important results have been achieved and that these results are a serious contribution to the literature. This work will contribute to intensive research in cardiovascular diseases I think.

My comments are included at the bottom of this letter.

1. The long-term follow-up period of the patients was not specified in the study. Please specify that.

2. In addition, your clinical prediction model is not correct. You should have Cox regression analysis instead of logistic regression. Moreover, in the logistic regression model you are choosing, it is not clear how you choose the variables and whether they are overfitting.

3. When the Cox regression is performed, the selection of variable should be followed by the rule 1:10.

4. Author names are not written in the ninth (9. ref) reference. Please write the names of the authors.

I think this paper can be accepted after revisions.

Best regards.

**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.

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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