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Dear Prof. Rosa Sicari

Dear Prof. Piotr Lipiec

I admire the authors' effort. The problem of prediction CRT responders has an incremental value. The way the paper is written makes it difficult to understand, especially in methodology section.

- Figure 2 does not help to understand the way of transformation the data.

- Figure 3 and 4 makes it difficult to evaluate which wall is represented in the define sector

- The lack of data about the scar location is the major limitation. Also we do not know the data about the period from ACS to the implantation of CRT. If it is a long period and we have the data from echo and strain we may try to establish the scar location. The value of strain and the thickness of the myocardium have a good diagnostic value.

- The authors have data from thoracic CT scans available only for 21 patients (15 responders, 6 non-responders). In my opinion we can not make a conclusion if we have data only for the 6 persons (without data for scar).

- I would like to ask you what kind of test you performed and the statistical values for the collinearity Baseline ICA4 and relative reduction of ICA4.

I recommend the paper for publication after minor corrections.
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