

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 16821-review.doc).

Title: Closing patent foramen ovale in cryptogenic stroke: The underscored importance of other interatrial shunt variants

Author: Gianluca Rigatelli, Alberto Rigatelli

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Cardiology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 16821

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

A) Format has been updated as well as all the requirements embedded in the text by the editorial team (changes highlined in yellow)

B) Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer:

REVIEWER 01206034

1-as suggested we improve readability of the pathophysiology of ASD and PFO adding two new figure: Figure 1 and Figure 2 and relative legends and we specified the location in to the text of Figure 3. By the way we do not agree that further simplifications are needed: pathophysiology of ASD and PFO and relative haemodynamics should be patrimony of all medical students rather than expert cardiologist. We think that the text is simple enough.

2- The data provided in the conjunction section are provided in order to understand the peculiar characteristics of patients with hybrid defects and to help to distinguishing between pfo and hybrid defect.

3- We added a paragraph in the last section of the manuscript about our view to practically performed a differential diagnosis between the two entities

4- we deleted the acronym sASD.

5- we deleted ref 11-12

6- we checked the manuscript with the aid of a native language speaker

REVIEWER 012040088

Honestly we do not understand the revision suggested by the reviewer. It seems that the reviewer did not read the paper at all. We do not agree to provide detail about methods to detecting patients who benefit from catheter repair, because it is not the focus of the paper. In the same way, we do not agree to provide subheadings, because the format of minireview does not require them. Moreover what would mean results or methods and materials in a mini review article type? By the way a compact abstract has been already provided.

REVIEWER 608588

Thanks for you nice comments!

C) References and typesetting were corrected following the guideline of the journal.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Cardiology*.

With my best personal regards

Dr Gianluca Rigatelli, MD, PhD, EBIR, FACC, FSCAI, FESC, FACP