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Re: Preventing complicated transseptal puncture with intracardiac echocardiography: case report
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Dear Prof. Picano,

Please find the revised manuscript, which has been corrected according to the reviewers comments for review and publication by your journal. We agreed with the issues raised and we hope that we have addressed them satisfactory. This has certainly improved the paper. Our detailed answers to the reviewer’s comments are presented on separate sheets.

We hereby certify that this paper is not under consideration by any other publication and has not been published elsewhere. All of the co-authors participated in the preparation, have seen the manuscript and agree with its content and the conclusions of the work. There is no conflict of interest in publishing this paper.

Yours sincerely,

T. Szili-Torok, MD, PhD
T. Shalganov, MD
On behalf of the authors
Detailed answer for the comments of reviewer 1:

1. In the case presentation, page 3 the expression "A seventy-years old" has been changed to "A seventy-year-old".
2. On page 3, lines 23 and 25 the expression "fossal membrane" has been changed to "fossa ovalis membrane".
3. The sentence on page 5, line 11 has been rephrased.
4. In the Conclusions section the sentence "To the best of our knowledge this is the first case in which ICE helps a transseptal procedure to be interrupted because of a risk of complications deemed unacceptably high." has been deleted.
5. The reference numbers in the Discussion section have been grouped.
6. Figure 1 has been deleted. The numbering of the remaining figures has been changed accordingly.

Detailed answer for the comments of reviewer 2:

1. According to the recommendation of the reviewer we added a brief discussion on the value of ICE compared to TEE. New references have been added to the Reference list (References 5 and 6).
2. According to the recommendation of the reviewer we added a new paragraph describing other complications avoidable with the use of ICE at the end of the Discussion section. Indeed, new references have been added to the Reference list (References 7 and 8).