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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor:
Thank you for your kind letter of September 26, 2012. We have revised the entire manuscript entitled “Electrocardiogram features of premature ventricular contractions/ventricular tachycardia originating from the left ventricular outflow tract and the treatment outcome of radiofrequency catheter ablation” in accordance with the editor and reviewers’ comments. We acknowledge your suggestions very much, which are very valuable in improving the quality of our manuscript.

Here below is our description on revision according to the comments.

Reviewer 1
The manuscript is well written but slightly long. I recommend in favor of accepting the manuscript for publication.

The authors’ Answer: Corrected accordingly.

Reviewer 2
Major revisions
1. The reviewer’s comment:
Page 5 Line 7-2 patients demonstrated reduced EF and yet the EF is noted to be 52 and 59% - how is this considered reduced? Was this a typographical error – if so the correct data should replace this.

The authors’ Answer: We apologize to you for our carelessness in the data. The correct data have been added to in the revised manuscript. (See page 5, Line 7).

2. The reviewer’s comment: Page 5 Line 7/8- “All cases were cured by ablation”
how is this possible with an overall success rate of 90%- is this considered clinical cure- this should be clarified.

The authors’ Answer: This was a typographical error. We corrected the error in the revised manuscript. The sentence “All cases were cured by ablation” have been changed to “All patients were referred for ablation.”.

3. The reviewer’s comment: Suggestions for structural changes to the paper.....
   The authors’ Answer: Corrected accordingly.

Minor revisions
1. The reviewer’s comment: What was the average and range of the LV dimensions for all patients and then specifically for the patients deemed to be dilated
   The authors’ Answer: Corrected accordingly (See page 5).
2. The reviewer’s comment: Line 3- eliminate “all day”....... 
   The authors’ Answer: Corrected accordingly.
3. The reviewer’s comment: Subheading: ECG examination and measurement:
   Line 3.....; Line 7.........; Page 6 Line 2/3......
   The authors’ Answer: Corrected accordingly.
4. The reviewer’s comment: Subheading: Intracardiac Electrophysiologic examination and radiofrequency ablation treatment:
   The authors’ Answer: All were corrected accordingly.
5. The reviewer’s comment: Page 7: Line 4- be specific about the catheter size used
   The authors’ Answer: Corrected accordingly.
6. The reviewer’s comment: Subheading: Follow up methods
   Line 2.....; Line 5....... 
   The authors’ Answer: All corrected accordingly.
7. The reviewer’s comment: Subheading: Results; Mapping and Ablation Results of PVCs/VT originating from the LVOT
   Line 1.....; page 10 Line 10.......; page 10 Line 12-14.......; page 10 Line 29 
   The authors’ Answer: All corrected accordingly.
8. The reviewer’s comment: Page 11: Line 2.....; Page 13....
   The authors’ Answer: All corrected accordingly.
9. The reviewer’s comment: . Page 14: Discussion: ECG characteristics of the PVC that originated from LVOT. Line 2, 5, 18-20, 21……. 
The authors’ Answer: All corrected accordingly.

9. The reviewer’s comment: . Page 15: Line 8…; Page 16 line 18, 21, 24, 26, 27
The authors’ Answer: All corrected accordingly.

10. The reviewer’s comment: . Page 17 line 10, 12, 18, 24…; Page 18 line 2
The authors’ Answer: All corrected accordingly.

Thank you and all the reviewers for the kind advice.

Sincerely yours,
Lin Jia-Feng
2012.10.25