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Reviewer's report:

In the Manuscript entitled “Outcome of open and endovascular repair in acute type B aortic dissection”, the Authors compared, with retrospective analysis, the early and late mortality and morbidity of patients who underwent surgical or endovascular treatment for acute type B aortic dissection.

This is a very interesting study because actually, the treatment of choice for acute type B aortic dissection remains a debated issue. Infact in the last decades, open aortic surgery has remained the treatment of choice for thoracic aortic disease and endovascular aortic repair has been introduced as alternative to surgical repair, but its role remains a matter of debate.

However, I have the following issues for the Authors.

Major concerns:

1) Methods: In the literature the use of cerebrospinal fluid catheter represents a strategy to decrease the risk of postoperative neurologic dysfunction during aortic operations due to ischemic injury because of aortic cross-clamping or sustained hypotension in open repair. Authors reported that cerebrospinal fluid catheter was inserted before the procedure in patients of both study groups. What is the indication for preoperative cerebrospinal fluid drainage placement in patients who underwent TEVAR?

2) Results: The authors should analyze, among the outcome events, the rate of reinterventions and should compare this incidence in both groups of study with statistical analysis (for example: student’s t-test). The authors could specify these results in “Results and discussion” session and insert in table 2.

Minor concerns:

1. As reported in the Conclusion session, the limitation of this study was the small sample size of the two groups and that the two groups of patients are not entirely comparable. The authors should specify that another limitation of this study is the long time of enrollment of patients.

2. Table 1: In table 1 there is a typing error in the last line of the third column. The authors should erase the symbol of percentage and change “30,8 %” with “30,8”.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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