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Reviewer's report:

General

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. What do you think about the reason of pseudoaneurysm in this patient? (Myocardial infarction, rupture of arterial pseudoaneurysm etc.). It should be discussed in the paper.
2. Need more detailed explanation of echocardiographic findings, like valvular dysfunction, LV wall motion abnormalities, anatomical location of the aneurysm and ratio of pseudoaneurysm orifice to radius which is the diagnostic criteria for pseudoaneurysm.
3. What about the coronary angiographic findings? Were there any narrowings indicating coronary artery disease on his coronary angiography?
4. One picture of the pseudoaneurysm taken at the surgery can be put instead of one of the CT images (for example image four).
5. On his chest X-ray (figure one), the arrow seems to be indicating some structure on his right side of his chest, the direction of the arrow is not clear also I'm not sure whether it's showing it's right place for the pseudoaneurysm, since the chest X-ray findings and CT-MRI findings are contradictory in terms of the location of the pseudoaneurysm.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing <a href="http://www.ntsearch.com/search.php?q=labels&v=56">labels</a> on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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