

## ANSWERING REVIEWERS

We thank the reviewers for their helpful comments which allowed us to remarkably improve our manuscript. Below we tried to address each comment indicating our response in bold text. Changes in the manuscript are highlighted in green.

### Reviewer #1

#### **Comments for the Author (Required):**

It is a well-written case report about extraction of CS lead. The summary of previous reports about the extraction of CS lead should be added, for instance, the cause of the adhesion, the complication of lead extraction.

**We thank the reviewer for the comment. We have added the possible explanations about complications during lead extraction in the discussion, referring to ref n.6 (Sheldon et al, J Interven Cardiac Electrophysiol 2012).**

### Reviewer #2

#### **Comments for the Author (Required):**

This is a rare case report about coronary sinus lead extraction using new techniques. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have no question about this manuscript.

**We thank the reviewer for the comment.**

### Reviewer #3

#### **Comments for the Author (Required):**

The case report of Bontempi and coll shows a challenging extraction of a coronary sinus catheter. The case is interesting and well presented. This reviewer has no further comments.

**We thank the reviewer for the comment.**

### Reviewer #4

#### **Comments for the Author (Required):**

Thanks. But this case report does not include any new information.

**We thank the reviewer for the comment. However, we believe that there are two interesting and rare points in this case report: the extended fibrous adhesions (figure 4) found at the tip of a CS lead recently implanted and the non-standard techniques used for its transvenous extraction.**