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Reviewer’s report:

I thank the authors for testing different window levels. The findings certainly show that it is plausible that window settings may have contributed to the results found. Obviously the sample is too small to reach definite conclusions. There was some misunderstanding about my intention though. The point is that decreasing the window level and increasing the width each would increase myocardial volume. The combination used which included decreasing the width negates the reduction in the window level, therefore decreasing the myocardial volume. My intention was to test each separately. Nonetheless the conclusions remain the same. A mean difference of 19ml, as found, is approx. 10% of shell volume, which could significantly change the results of the study.

The reported range needs to be corrected - If the difference is -19ml, then the range cannot be -25 to +65ml.

I thank the authors for rewording their conclusions, which I think makes a much fairer impression.
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