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Reviewer's report:

The authors reported the comparison of results between percutaneous closure of ASD and TEE guided ASD closure.
My comments are below:
1) At page 5, "Although traditional open-heart surgery is safe with excellent outcomes for all types of ASD, CPB, and sternotomy are important factors that might lead to increased postoperative complications." I do not think surgical closure of ASD has many issues related to CPB and sternotomy.

2) At page 7, "a ostium premium defect or venous sinus ASD" These are misspelling. I can see other misspelling through the manuscript.

3) At table 2, I am unable to see the meaning of "Procedure successful" Does this mean "no residual shunt"? Again, "successful in one month" was 98% in Group A, and this improved to 100% in three month. The readers will get confused unless these terms are defined clearly.

4) The authors did not show clear evidence of benefits of TEE guided ASD closure compared with surgical closure. Given that surgical ASD closure is almost 100% successful in many centers, the authors’ method has not much beneficial points except for better cosmetic appearance.
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