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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Absence of a coronary artery can be classified by the famous "Lipton's Yamanaka classification of Single coronary artery (SCA)". Why did not you consider mentioning this on your report? Please check this article, "https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.radcr.2022.08.089" and consider mentioning the Lipton's type SCA that you found in CAG. This suggested article was prepared by me; you may or may not use this as one of the references if you wish to keep the classification.

2. This is an incidental finding I understand, so why don't you highlight this on your title someway?

3. In the last sentence of your Abstract's conclusion, I think a segment "....main means by which to diagnose..." is unnecessary and "...main means which diagnose..." is enough.

4. In the second sentence of second paragraph on discussion part where the mechanism of ST-T changes is being described, a segment "...relative lack of myocardium..." does not make sense. Should not it be something like, "...relative lack of myocardial supply..."?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a case report of a patient in whom coronary angiogram led to be diagnosed as congenital absence of right coronary artery. Computed tomography coronary angiography was refused by the patient. This case report was written well, but has some aspects to be noted. 1: It will be better that the Video file contains the coronary angiogram showing the authors were struggling to identify the right coronary artery. The authors should show the Video file of Figure1B. 2: Usually, the severity of atherosclerotic changes is evaluated by CTCA or intravascular imaging (IVUS or CCT), not only by the CAG. What is the reason that the authors introduced the antiplatelets and statins in this patient?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Contribution to the literature should be continued. And, sharing rare cases like this makes difference in the future. Keep it up!