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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
It would be nice to add to the conclusion ways of reducing the blood pressure variability
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Despite the lack of novelty and the small sample size, the manuscript is generally well written. I have some comments: 1. What is the definition of readmission? 2. KM survival curve of MACE is needed of Systolic and Diastolic SD. 3. Data of LVEF, prior MI, prior PCI, CKD should be added. 4. Though the electronic medical record was queried and BP recordings (n=25,844) both from within and outside the hospital from patients. Details of blood pressure measurement were not mentioned. Where? How? Standard?