

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Cardiology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 22066

Manuscript Type: Minireviews

Collateral findings during computed tomography scan for atrial fibrillation ablation: let's take a look around

Francesco Perna, Michela Casella, Maria Lucia Narducci, Antonio Dello Russo, Gianluigi Bencardino, Gianluca Pontone, Gemma Pelargonio, Daniele Andreini, Nicola Vitulano, Francesca Pizzamiglio, Edoardo Conte, Filippo Crea, Claudio Tondo

Reviewer 02446694

The authors reviewed the collateral findings during CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation. This review included representative cases at their institution and summary table about collateral findings during CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation. This review is well-written and seems to be interesting. I have one question as a reviewer. 1) CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation is not always familiar to the general cardiologists. Therefore, the authors had better provide information about the procedure of CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation. The CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation is the same of that for coronary artery disease, or includes any specific procedure for atrial fibrillation ablation. 2) In Figure 2 in the "Figure legends", there was a spelling mistake of "artery".

Authors' reply: We thank the reviewer for his/her comments. 1) The CT scan performed for atrial fibrillation ablation is a little different as the CT scan performed for coronary artery disease. According to the reviewer's request, we added some more information about this imaging procedure (Pages 5 and 6, paragraph "IMAGE INTEGRATION IN ATRIAL FIBRILLATION ABLATION"). The text we added is highlighted. 2) We thank the reviewer for notifying us about that spelling mistake, that we corrected (Figure Legend, Figure 2).

Reviewer 00227375

This is an excellent review about the incidental findings detected by cardiac CT for AF catheter ablation. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have a few minor comments about this manuscript. Please consider the following comments. (Comments) 1. Page 11, line 13 I think the authors probably make a mistake. Reference seems to be "[42]", not "[41]". Sorry if I have got it wrong. 2. Table 1 Correct "Martins et al [33]" to "Martins et al [34]". Correct "Schietinger et al [34]" to "Schietinger et al [33]".

Authors' reply: We thank the reviewer for his/her encouraging comments and precious support. We corrected the mistakes we made in references assignation.

Reviewer 02638028

This manuscript is a review about the collateral findings during CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation. As authors mentioned, the optimal strategy to manage collateral findings should be

considered and this manuscript help assessing the problem. However, collateral findings detected during CT scan for coronary artery disease is a similar problem and it should be discussed together within this manuscript. Are there any differences between collateral findings during CT scans for atrial fibrillation ablation and coronary artery disease?

Authors' reply: We thank the reviewer for his/her support and comments. Collateral findings detected by cardiac CT are the same for both CTs performed for coronary artery disease and for atrial fibrillation ablation. There are much more data and published papers about collateral findings detected during coronary artery disease studies, as compare to CT scans performed for AF ablation. Since this was an invited review, we were requested to discuss specifically collateral findings detected during CT studies for AF ablation. Thus we focused only on CT scan performed for atrial fibrillation ablation, as requested in the invitation letter, and we chose the manuscript title accordingly. Discussing also collateral findings detected during CT scan for coronary artery disease would mean almost re-writing the review. However, we are available to change both the title and the manuscript, adding data from CT scans performed for coronary artery disease screening, if the reviewer considers it worthwhile or necessary.

Reviewer 00227470

The authors wrote a short review article on how to deal with incidental findings on CT's performed in the work-up of EFO procedures. There is nothing very special/novel on this article, however, current data are well summarized. I do not have specific comments on how to improve the paper.

Authors' reply: We thank the reviewer for his/her support.