

Dear Editor:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Association between ventricular repolarization variables and cardiac diastolic function: a cross-sectional study of a healthy Chinese population" (ID 45305). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are listed below. We greatly appreciate your time and efforts to improve our manuscript for publication.

Sincerely,

Li Zhidan

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer: #1(Reviewer's code 03702209)

We appreciate for the reviewer's warm work earnestly and thanks very much for your good comments.

Reviewer: #2(Reviewer's code 03846820)

Comment 1: Would you please kindly to underline the novelty of your paper and briefly describe any accomplishments in the field first of all with a focus on the associations between QT interval and diastolic function. Please, mention and evaluate with the elaborated discussion the

achievements of Belardinelli, 2009, Wilcox, 2011, Khan, 2016, etc.

Response: Thank you for your kindly suggestion. We have evaluated with the elaborated discussion the achievements of Wilcox et al., Khan et al, and Sauer et al. in the background section.

Comment 2: Please, mention is that a sort of the expert analysis? How it was checked out?

Response: Thank you for your kindly comment. We think this study is a sort of the expert analysis. Both Electrocardiography and Echocardiography were performed according to published guidelines. All echocardiograms were reviewed by a single trained reader who was unaware of the electrocardiographic data.

Comment 3: There must be a justification of your sample size with the provided sample size calculation. You have another way over there with any assessment of the statistical power.

Response: We completely agree with the reviewer's opinion. We have added the detail register criteria and healthy subject selection process in the materials and methods section.

Comment 4: Correct all your typos throughout the manuscript including the blanks.

Response: Revised as suggested.

Comment 5: There must be a future perspective at the end of the paper or correctly of your Discussion.

Response: Thank you for your kindly suggestion. Epidemiological studies suggest that there is a latent phase during which diastolic dysfunction is present and progresses in severity before the symptoms of HF arise. This asymptomatic phase represents a potential time to intervene and thereby prevent symptomatic heart failure. The latency between dysfunction and symptoms represents the best time for using effective diagnostics and therapies. Identifying a pharmacological intervention to restore repolarization to a more normal state may be a novel target for therapy.

Comment 6: At least a few plots is required to upgrade statistically the paper making it more valuable.

Response: Revised as suggested.

Reviewer: #3(Reviewer's code 03722832)

Comment: Similarity index of your submission is 50%, please improve.

Response: Thank you for your kindly suggestion, though similarity index of our submission is 16% in the crosscheck report that we received from the editorial office. We would like to express our sincere apologies to have so many overlapped descriptions in our manuscript, and we also really appreciate that you give us the opportunity to improve. We have revised the manuscript to avoid overlapped sentences with our previous papers.