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This is a very interesting case report. Some points have to be clarified before publication.

Comments

1. Introduction: 1nd paragraph. Situs inversus, that involves dextrocardia, is a very important finding in the definition of Kartagener syndrome. So please add situs inversus by reforming the last sentence of 1st paragraph.

2. Was the patient’s condition associated with azospermia?

3. Introduction: 2nd paragraph. Please delete sentence: Due to the lack of experience…..of the surgeon. Then reform the sentence to render your case report more attractive: Several cases of surgical…have been reported in the literature, however, we were unable to find any case of a patient with Kartagener syndrome, necessitating coronary bypass.

4. The authors mention in the introduction that their patient suffered from COPD. However, in the case report FEV1/FVC is very much in favor of a restrictive or a mixte respiratory disease (both obstructive and restrictive), that fits very much with bronchiectasis, considering both ratios of FEV1/FVC, litters and % of the predicted values, but this cannot be further defined, since we do not have static volumes. In any case NOT an obstructive one. Therefore, they MUST change “COPD” in their introduction chapter. Also respiratory insufficiency is defined by blood gases, and NOT by spirometric data (FEV1 or FVC). Therefore, please delete this term. The accurate term for the patient’s respiratory condition is: chronic respiratory disease.

5. Please give definition of all abbreviations used (eg LAD, RIMA, LIMA etc).

6. Please put the word “Discussion” after the “Case Report” chapter.

7. Please reform the paragraph of the discussion chapter starting by Saad et al made an excellent work….., unless you have copied directly the table from Saad et al, then you must put the reference at the Table. I suggest you to totally rewrite this paragraph.

8. Discussion must be focus on differences between operation between simple dextrocardia and the case of the authors. Is there any difference in the technique and the outcome of patients?
9. In the conclusion the first sentence, must start by “Kartagener syndrome is a rare condition…, as it is not known in the case report whether the patient had dextrosplachnea (situs inversus totalis). Also Conclusion is too long. It must be not more than 2 sentences, giving the “take-home message”. I suggest you to re-write conclusion, as most of the information given actually are more likely “discussion” than “conclusion”.
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