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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

We really thanks for your efforts to improve our paper. We have gone through the whole article and found several grammar and spelling errors. With the help from an English speaker (Professor Saroj-Thapa), we have done careful correction regarding to grammar and spelling errors. Meanwhile, we included a cover letter with a point-by-point response to your comments.

Point-by point response:

Question: In the Introduction, the Authors write that "With the tricuspid valve replaced, endocardial pacing of the right ventricle is not possible". This statement needs to be properly referenced.

In the same paragraph, also the sentence "left ventricular endocardial pacing via the atrial septum puncture was contraindicated" requires a reference.

Answer: Dear editor, these two sentences have been referenced.
Question: The quality of written English is still unsuitable for publication. Furthermore, there are several grammar and spelling errors. Some examples:

- Page 2, Abstract, Line 31: "the patient of pacemaker dependent presented no any deteriorations"

Answer: We have revised this sentenced into “the patient of pacemaker dependency did not present any deteriorations of heart function with good pacing parameters”.

Question- Same page, line 36: "In this patient developed complete AVB"

Answer: We have revised it into “In this patient developing complete AVB”.

Question- Page 3, Introduction, line 23: "dyssynchroniaztion"

Answer: We have revised it into “dyssynchronization”.

Question- Page 4, line 25

Answer: we have revised it into “After taking full consideration of the patient’s basic situations”.

Question- Page 4, line 48

Answer: We have revised it into “As the lateral cardiac vein was too thin”.

Question- Page 4, line 59: "Medica"

Answer: We have revised it into “Medical”.

Question- Page 5, line 26: "was evaluate"

Answer: We have revised it into “was evaluated”.

Question- Page 5, line 50

Answer: We have revised it into “During one-year follow-up”.

Question- Page 6, Discussion, line 6: "we firstly described"
Answer: We have revised it into “We first described”.

Question- Page 6, line 9: "coronary venous tributaries"
Answer: We have revised it into “coronary venous system”.

Question- Page 6, line 15
Answer: We have revised it into “In this patient, as the mechanical tricuspid and mitral valves implanted”.

Question- Page 6, line 53
Answer: We have revised it into “What’s more”.

Question- Page 7, line 12
Answer: We have revised it into “the dual-site ventricular pacing via coronary sinus method was primarily chosen”.

Question- Page 7, Conclusions, line 39: "can provides"
Answer: We have revised it into “can provide”.

This list is not exhaustive as provides only a few examples. The entire paper needs to be carefully revised by a native English speaker.

Question: Page 5, line 39. The decrease in pacing threshold could not be defined "obvious". Please reword.
Answer: We have revised it into “A remarkable decline in pacing threshold”.

Thanks sincerely,

Jia-feng.