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COMMENTS
This investigation was carried out in 186 children under three years of age with diagnosis of ASD (OS) selected between September 2010 and September 2018. The study has the merit to approach young children adding information through a comprehensive comparative analysis of the immediate, short- and long-term results after percutaneous and intraoperative device closure.

I have comments and suggestions related to the structure and presentation of the text besides some points I would like to raise:

Taking into account, that the authors described in the text no residual shunts at the 6-months follow-up evaluation and considering that the Table 2 shows residual shunt of 3.4% (Group A) and 8.2% (Group B), it would be better if the immediate and short-term outcomes in the two groups should be presented separately. Additionally, for the better understanding of results it is necessary to mention the intervals of time (months) that were considered as short-term and long-term outcomes.

Although the successful closure rates were high, their percentages and the two failed cases presented in "Results" should also be included in "Summary".

A description of the mean (SD) and the median of follow-up in both groups as well as the minimum and the maximum period of follow-up should be included in "Results'.

I think it would be better to include in "Methods" the meaning of a "significant secundum ASD" as described by the authors in the text.

Considering the results of this investigation, I would like to suggest including in "Conclusions", the high point of the discussion, which was the importance of the selection criteria which led the allocation of patients for the two techniques of device closure (Group A and Group B).
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