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Reviewer's report:

In this study, You Zhou and colleagues retrospectively followed up 835 patients who had ICD implantation for primary and secondary prevention.

They found that although patients with ICD for secondary prevention had more episodes of ventricular arrhythmia and thus appropriate initial therapy, patients who had ICD for primary prevention had a higher rate of subsequent appropriate therapy. These patients tended to be older, with NYHA III-IV heart failure and to have ischaemic heart disease.

Comments

I have followed the authors response to prior reviewer comments and most are adequate and acceptable.

The discussion is still not clear on why the rate of subsequent appropriate pacing was higher in the primary prevention group. What does the enrolment based on LVEF mean in terms of arrhythmia recurrence in this group?
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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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