

22<sup>nd</sup> October 2018

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript "Risk of sudden cardiac death: are chronic occlusions an additional risk factor?".

We welcome all the reviewers' comments and we are pleased that most of the reviewers had really positive feedback.

The responses to the reviewers' comments are shown below. We have put the reviewer's comments in bold and our response follows.

We would be grateful if you could please consider our revised manuscript for publication in World Journal of Cardiology.

Kind Regards,

Dr Ioannis Merinopoulos

#### **Reviewer 4**

**This is a well written letter about the impact of CTOs in the risk of sudden death according to the data derived from the meta-analysis of Chi w et al. There is a continuous debate in the literature and the authors present briefly the current practice guidelines about the management of these patients.**

We thank the reviewer for their supporting comments

#### **Reviewer 3**

**This is an excellent Editorial. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have no question about this manuscript.**

We are very grateful to the reviewer for their positive comments.

#### **Reviewer 2**

**ESPS Manuscript NO: 41966 Title: Risk of sudden cardiac death: are chronic total occlusions an additional risk factor? This letter to editor highlights the problem of risk factors that have to be include in decision for ICD in prevention of SCD. The text is easy to follow as well as readable and presentable giving the accepted guidelines. In addition, the authors gave additional recommendations, which are results of Chi et al analysis as well as needs for further investigation of implementation of CTO as additional risk factor for SCD. Overall, the letter is well written and the reported work is of the great interest to the readers.**

We thank the reviewer for their positive comments.

#### **Reviewer 1**

**the study is badly written and disorganized and didn't add any new to the topic of the research. the language is also need good editing. the reference are badly written and need to be rewritten.**

We are a group of native British speakers working in a British institution therefore extremely surprised to receive a comment that our language “is also need good editing”, which we respectfully disagree. With regards to the comment that this manuscript does not provide new research, this is an Editorial and as such our intention was not to provide new data to the topic but to make a constructive comment on the recently published study by Chi et al. We have taken the comment about references on board and revised them according to the World Journal of Cardiology guidelines and Editor’s comments.