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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study about prognostic significance of a relatively simple echocardiographic parameter like RWT but there are some critical issues that need to be addressed. Low RWT groups have significantly lower EF, higher LVEDV, higher prevalence of severe MR, higher (numerically) pro-BNP, all known negative prognostic factors. Paradoxically they have less mortality. Was this population affected by HFpEF? Please the authors comment and try to explain the reason in the discussion.

Suggestions: Diastolic blood pressure and hospital stay in days should be reported if available.

Grammatical errors: In the abstract line 19: Only adjusted Cox model showed that High-RWTPW should be showed that High-RWTIVS+PWIn the abstract "was a significant risk" should be "was associated with a significant risk of the primary outcome". Line 10 page 1 left ventricle wall tickness "is represented by" IVS and PW. Line 19 page 1 "were examined and compared" should be deleted.
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