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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer reports:
Thank you for your revision.
We suggest to address a few additional issues.

Dear Reviewer, thank you for your comments that helped improves the manuscript.

Please, indicate your population with an acronym that indicate more clearly that they have grade I diastolic dysfunction (i.e. DDI or DD1).

R: As recommended, we included the acronym “DDI” for patients with grade-I diastolic dysfunction.
Abstract, results: it is not so clear what the non-significant p values of 0.37 and 0.53 refer to. Please, briefly explain it better.

R: These values are described with their confidence intervals in table IV and refer to the comparison between TDI-MPI vs PWD-MPI sensitivity and specificity, respectively: 74% vs. 64%; p: 0.37 and 61% vs. 69%; p: 0.53. Note that in order to avoid misinterpretation these values were taken from the abstract but remaining in Table IV.

About the criteria you used for DD definition, we appreciate that you checked your results with the new criteria. Please, add these considerations also in the discussion/limitations of the study, as well as the lack of other echo parameters, such as left atrial volume index, pulmonary artery systolic pressure.

R: As recommended we add these considerations in the discussion /limitations of the article where they are highlighted