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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?  
Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.  
Comments: None

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?  
Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.  
a. The relevant patient information, including:  
- De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)  
- Main symptoms of the patient  
- Medical, family and psychosocial history  
- Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

b. The relevant physical examination findings

c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:  
- Diagnostic methods  
- Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)  
- Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits
Comments: None

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?
   Comments: Yes

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.
   Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
   Comments: Yes

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
   Comments: The present case series need

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?
   The authors report three cases of coronary-cameral fistula which have been successfully managed using transcatheter coil closure. In case 1, what was the indication for surgical ligation at the first place?

   Why did the surgical ligation fail?

   When the treatment for large coronary-cameral fistula is transcatheter coil occlusion as per the ACC/AHA guideline as favorable over surgical modality when the features are favorable, the present case series do not add novel findings or new knowledge.

   In the discussion part, the authors mention several disadvantages of surgical over percutaneous transcatheter closure like sternotomy wound and associated healing complications, wound infection, post pericardiotomy syndrome, bleeding, cardiopulmonary bypass and hospital stay. How significant are these differences? Are there any studies in literature comparing the two procedures and complication rates with respect to coronary-cameral fistula.
**Level of interest**
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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