Response to Reviewer 1

We would like to thank the Reviewer for the careful reading of our manuscript and for the valuable and constructive comments. We have addressed all concerns raised, and the manuscript has been revised accordingly. Below we provide a detailed, point-by-point response. All changes are made in red.

1. Abstract: ß= **standardized coefficient** is different from **B= unstandardized coefficient.**

So the abstract must be corrected: self-care score (**ß** = 0.083 per point), BMI (**ß** = 0.368 per kg/m²), comorbidity burden (**ß** = -0.401 per comorbidity), and NYHA class (NYHA III: **ß**= -2.425; NYHAIV: **ß** = -5.966, vs. NYHA II)

Response:
The Abstract has been revised to correctly report unstandardized coefficients (B) instead of β. The description has been clarified to ensure consistency with the regression model presented in the manuscript.

2. The authors are inconsistent with their decimal places for variables like age, weight and BMI. It looks like lack of proofreading.

Response:
All numerical values throughout the manuscript have been carefully reviewed and standardized. Continuous variables (e.g., age, weight, BMI) are now consistently reported with one decimal place, ensuring uniformity and improving readability.

3. Also they frequently report both the mean and median, which creates confusion. The choice of descriptive statistics should follow the results of the Shapiro-Wilk normality test (as mentioned in Methods). For example, in **Table 3**, the Mann-Whitney test, a non parametric measure, was used but the authors keep reporting both the mean and median in Table 3. The authors should only report the metric that matches the data's distribution.

Response:
We have revised the presentation of descriptive statistics in accordance with the distribution of the data. Since most variables did not follow a normal distribution, non-parametric tests were applied. Accordingly, in Table 3 and related sections, we now report median and interquartile ranges only, and the mean values have been removed to ensure methodological consistency.

4. The multivariate regression analysis did not report the **Coefficient of Determination (*R*²)**result, which is necessary to evaluate the model's goodness-of-fit. And the authors must provide the **Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)** to assess potential multicollinearity among the predictors.

Response:

The Coefficient of Determination (R^2) has now been added to the Results section. In addition, multicollinearity was assessed using the Variance Inflation Factor, as now described

in the Methods section. The Results section has been updated to report that all VIF values were low, indicating no evidence of multicollinearity among the predictors.