

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors have well described the short term outcomes of HF with preserved EF from a large retrospective database. It would have been excellent to see the impact of Medications on short term outcomes as noted by authors in limitation.. Few minor comments are noted - 1. There is no stirred abstract-Please provide one. 2. Why individual comorbidities like anemia, CAD etc. were not taken into account while calculating independent predictors of 30 day readmission. 3. Please provide reference for Charlson comorbidity index. 4. The reference format need to be changed. 5. Few grammatical errors -"Portrends" need correction. 6. "Combining all cardiac readmission etiologies our study found about 26.3% readmissions were due to cardiac etiologies." - please explain.

Dear reviewer,

Thank you for your valuable comments. Please see below my response of your questions.

1. There is no stirred abstract-Please provide one.

I have updated the abstract per your recommendation.

2. Why individual comorbidities like anemia, CAD etc. were not taken into account while calculating independent predictors of 30 day readmission.

Ans; There is a way to do the that but due to limitation of database, we decided to go ahead with Charlson comorbidity index and grouped it into lower to higher no of comorbidities. This method has been used for several similar research work,

3. Please provide reference for Charlson comorbidity index.

Ans: I have added the reference.

4. The reference format need to be changed.

And; I have updated the reference format per journal requirement.

5. Few grammatical errors -"Portends" need correction.

Ans: Thank you for finding this error. I have corrected it.

6. "Combining all cardiac readmission etiologies our study found about 26.3% readmissions were due to cardiac etiologies." - please explain.

Ans: Here we wanted to see that only cardiac causes of readmission like hypertensive heart and chronic kidney disease with heart failure, acute on chronic diastolic heart failure, hypertensive heart disease with heart failure in total makes 26.3% of all readmission.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear author, the article represents the results of a retrospective study with obscure objective. The article is written with the acceptable English-speaking adduction of the arguments. The article is sufficiently novel and very interesting to warrant publication. All the key elements are presented and described clearly. The most discussable options in the article are:

Dear reviewer,

Thank you for your valuable time to review this manuscript.

I have updated the manuscript per your suggestions and here are the answers of your specific questions.

1) Please correct all your multiple grammar errors and typos.

Ans: I have corrected these errors.

2) The statistical power must be properly comprehensively characterized. You must start with a clear definition of your study design. Please, explain the nature of your database. The population must be characterized. The options of statistical power, bias must be emphasized.

Ans: I am added more details regarding the study design.

3) I have failed to find out the objective of your study. Your Introduction must play a role of the justification for your objective which should be at the end of the Introduction. Your abstract does not have neither objective nor conclusion.

Ans: I have the objective in the last line of background.

4) You must provide the clinical definitions for all clinical conditions that were involved in the study. How diagnosis was made must be explained. Frankly, you do not have even a definition for HFpEF.

Ans: I have added definition of HFpEF with proper reference. The other used conditions are self explanatory in terminology and I have added that it was based on the ICD code generated during analysis by the database.

5) Would you please kindly elaborate on your Limitations?

Ans: I have updated that. Thanks!

6) Do you think there is room for plots and more sophisticated analysis?

Ans: As it was a straight forward analysis I have kept it simple in tabular form results as previous publications have used. Thanks.

7) The database looks interesting but your analysis is too superficial without in-depth understanding of the population that you have analyzed. This is a very major concern that must be addressed.

Ans: I have further added the population details as well as data base description. Thanks!

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

1、 Abstract and key words are needed to summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript

Ans: Thank you for valuable suggestion. I have added a formal abstract.

2、 The explanation of the research purpose in the background exposition needs to be more detailed and specific.

Ans: Thank you again, I have updated it.