

Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/acr-22-52>

Reviewer A

I would like to first thank you for considering the publication of these two interesting cases.

In general, the manuscript is well written.

Few comments,

Comment 1: In the abstract section (page 3, line 12), consider changing "absolutely" to "completely" resolved.

Reply 1: Thank you for your detailed review of our manuscript.

Change in the text: We have revised this per your suggestion (page 3, line 12).

Comment 2: In the introduction section (page 4, line 6), consider listing the common associated congenital anomalies (such as ASD, VSD, ... etc).

Reply 2: Thank you for your comment. Your suggestion greatly improves the quality of our manuscript.

Change in the text: We added the data regarding associated anomalies as your advised (page 4, line 6-7).

Comment 3: In Case presentation 1 (page 5, line 2), if RV systolic pressure of 85 mmHg is obtained from Echo, you may say "estimated" before RV systolic pressure.

Reply 3: Thank you for your useful suggestion.

Change in the text: We revised this per your suggestion (page 5, line 3).

Comment 4: In addition (page 5, line 3), consider changing the word "Regarding" to Because.

Reply 4: We appreciate your suggestion.

Change in the text: We have revised this as advised (page 5, line 5).

Comment 5: For the valve and annuloplasty ring (page 5, line 4), you may change to "31 mm St. Jude ..." instead of "number 31" and similarly for the ring, you may use "28 mm Edwards annuloplasty ring" rather than "number 28".

Reply 5: Thank you for your valuable comments.

Change in the text: We have revised these as advised (page 5, line 5-6).

Comment 6: Another suggestion for case 1, if you have a picture of the valve obtained during surgery, it would be interesting to include it in a figure.

Reply 6: Thank you for your valuable advice. We totally agree with your opinion that images of surgical specimens are very important and informative. Unfortunately, the images are not available.

Change in the text: N/A

Reviewer B

The authors presented two cases of double orifice mitral valve depicting variability on case reports of such condition. The discussion is of interest and well documented.

Comment 1: Please review the references inclusion (statement and references and not otherwise). Thanks for considering me for such review. A more clinical expert is required to validate my comments.

Reply 1: Thank you for your detailed review of our manuscript.

Change in the text: We have reviewed the references as you advised (page 9-10).