

Dear Prof. Ma

Thank you very much for your decision letter and advice on our manuscript entitled “Successful upgrade to cardiac resynchronization therapy for cardiac implantation-associated left subclavian vein occlusion: a case report”. We also thank the reviewer for the constructive comments and suggestions. We have revised the manuscript accordingly, and all amendments are indicated by red font in the revised manuscript. In addition, our point-by-point responses to the comments are listed below this letter.

This revised manuscript has been edited and proofread by professional editors at *Medjaden Bioscience Limited*.

We hope that our revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in your journal and look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Jinyan Zhong

First of all, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to the reviewer for his/her constructive and positive comments.

## **Replies to Reviewer 1**

### **Specific Comments**

1. The authors present a case of a 46-year-old man with total subclavian vein occlusion who successfully treated with an upgrade to a cardiac resynchronization therapy (CRT) pacemaker by utilizing transferable interventional coronary and radiological techniques. This is an interesting paper. However, there are some minor concerns: 1) The authors should clarify the reason for selection of CRT-P instead of CRT-D.

**Response:** We thank the reviewer for the thoughtful comment. We have addressed this issue raised by the reviewer in the revised manuscript (Page 5, Lines 101-102).

## **Replies to Science editor**

(1) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (3) The “Case Presentation” section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the “Case Presentation” section, and add the “FINAL DIAGNOSIS”, “TREATMENT”, and “OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP” sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

**Response:** As suggested, the “Case Presentation” section has been revised according to the Guidelines. “FINAL DIAGNOSIS”, “TREATMENT”, and “OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP” sections have been added in the main text in the revised manuscript.