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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study the authors reported the implantation of a device for the closure of a patent foramen ovale (PFO) in order to prevent a recurrence of stroke by monitoring the procedure with intracardiac echocardiography (ICE). Some criticism has to be manifested. They talk about the PFO as an abnormality certainly causally connected to the stroke and they depicted the procedure to close it as certainly life-saving. Unfortunately the PFO is very weakly connected to embolic events (stroke in particular) in the only prospective longitudinal study reported in the literature [1]. Most of our knowledge regarding the relationship between the PFO and stroke is based on data of association of PFO and stroke in weakly designed studies such as the case control studies. In addition the intervention of closure is fraught with possible certain complications in the follow-up [2]: thrombus formation on both facets of the umbrella device, most rarely umbrella dislocation and atrial arrhythmias (atrial fibrillation in particular) and some patients refer atypical chest pain after the closure. So the authors should present the case emphasizing the pros and cons of this procedure.

The authors say that ICE has got higher potential than transesophageal echocardiography in visualizing right cardiac masses (atrial mixoma and chiari network) and eventually to better visualize the anatomic features of the foramen ovale. They however forgot to mention the higher potential of this approach in visualizing major clinical problems such as lead endocarditis masses and post lead extraction floating masses inside the right atrial chamber the so called “ghosts” [3,4]. That must be added in order to better describe the ICE potential. The intracardiac echocardiographic images are difficult to decipher because of poor quality even for an expert in the field. Since they support the
main result of the study, images of better quality should be provided; alternatively a scheme put aside that could explain the details of the specific tomographic view has to be added. 
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors describe a case of PFO closure with ICE assistance. They have described the case and technique involved in good detail. There are definite advantages to ICE use in PFO closure as highlighted by authors - no need for TEE operator which conserves resources, potentially better imaging evaluation of PFO, ability to perform valsalva maneuver in the absence of anesthesia. This is a technique that should be highlighted in the interventional community.
RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 71767

Title: Novel way of patent foramen ovale detection and percutaneous closure by intracardiac echocardiography: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05138559

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Italy

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-12

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-26 11:47

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-27 06:43

Review time: 18 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[Y] Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Fair</td>
<td>[ ] Grade E: Do not publish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing</th>
<th>[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>[ ] Accept (High priority)</th>
<th>[Y] Accept (General priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Minor revision</td>
<td>[ ] Major revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer-reviewer</th>
<th>Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous</th>
<th>[ ] Onymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
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