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To: Vipin Zamvar and David Taggart, Editors of the Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery

Dear Editors,

enclosed please find the revised version of our paper entitled “Aortic coarctation: guidelines mismatch across the ocean” (man. number: 1683934001094623) to be reconsidered for publication in the Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery, revised on the basis of Reviewers’ suggestions.

We wish to thank you and the Reviewers for your interest in our paper and for the useful and constructive comments we have received.

As you will see, we have dealt with all the points of criticism raised by the Reviewers, and have modified our paper accordingly. We hope that with the changes we have made, you will find our manuscript suitable to be published in the Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery.

We look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Martino Pepe, MD PhD (first author)
Fortunato Iacovelli, MD (corresponding author)

Address for correspondence:
Fortunato Iacovelli
U.O. Cardiologia Universitaria, Policlinico, Piazza Giulio Cesare 11, 70124 Bari, Italy
E-mail: fortunato.iacovelli@teletu.it; Tel. +393200931665; Fax +390805478796
We thank this Reviewer for the constructive comments and suggestions. This is our point to point reply.

**Discretionary revisions**

1) **Could the authors speculate on the hemodynamic effects of a “pseudocoarctation”: what are the effects on afterload to the LV? Could this play a role in the development of the AR?**

   The observation is right. As requested, we better defined the pathophysiological features of pseudocoarctation at page 5: “aortic pseudocoarctation” definition, usually characterized by lower increase of the left ventricle after-load (as compared to “true CoA”) and milder pathophysiological effects such as the absence of collateral circulation” Moreover we want to stress that our case better matches the pseudocoarctation rather than true CoA definition, mentioning some somatometric data of the patient; we point out this concept at page 5 too: “Anyway, in the presented case, even when indexed to our patient’s body surface (2.1 m²), anatomical parameters did not reach threshold for intervention indication.”
We thank this Reviewer for the appreciation shown and for consideration of our manuscript for publication. According with the right issue erased, we minimally modify the quality of written English (e.g. removing all the contractions) throughout the all manuscript as it is signalled.