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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors reported a case of a congenitally corrected transposition of great vessels detected after a second cesarean section. The article is informative and well-written. I think the educational value of this article resides in the rarity of the scenario; it could help raise clinical suspicion for those cases. I only have some minor comments: 1) The running title is imprecise. It should be corrected to "cTGA diagnosed after cesarean section", because obviously the malformation is congenital, and its development has nothing to do with cesarean sections. 2) In the case presentation section of the main text, please clarify what you mean by the phrase "The ensuing progress was favourable". 3) It is remarkable that the patient weight was very low (37 KG). It would be better to mention her height or her BMI (since she is probably underweight). Additionally, could you find out whether she was malnourished? Were the patient's weight or general status better before her second pregnancy? I.e., is it reasonable to attribute heart failure to the low weight of the patient?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
In this manuscript, the authors reported a case of corrected transposition of the great arteries (cTGA) detected in a patient with post-cesarean pregnancy who had undergone elective cesarean section and was experiencing an episode of acute heart failure. It is helpful to carefully examine the congenital cardiac malformation in the perinatal period. This manuscript has a clear structure and conforms to the standards for writing case reports. I only have a minor comment on the title which is too long and could be refined.