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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions and Minor Essential Revisions

This is a succinct case report of endovascular stent grafting for ruptured acute type B aortic dissection. This modality of treatment has recently increased for acute type B dissection, and I congratulate their successful outcome, but the value of reporting this particular case is somewhat dubious to me unless the next question are to be answered or commented in the text.

1) A stressed point in the title, “left side mini-thoracotomy” was just for removal of clot and sanguineous fluid in the left chest? How a thoracotomy worked during endovascular stent deployment?

2) As to the title “interdisciplinary team”, who was a main operator of this procedure? Interventional radiologist? In your institution, is a surgeon not regularly involved in the endovascular stent procedure?

3) On page 3, “all abdominal arteries were feeded by the true lumen”. A lucky case it was. If some important abdominal arteries are feeded from the false lumen, how different strategy did you take? This statement should be written in the section of comment.

4) On page 3, “the LEFT FEMORAL ARTERY was surgically accessed and a TRANSVERSAL ARTERIOTOMY was performed”. On page 4, “we inserted the delivery system through the LONGITUDINAL INCISION in the LEFT COMMON FEMORAL ARTERY”. The reviewer cannot understand the 2 arteriotomy differences.

5) What did the authors consider the cause of cerebral infarction?

6) When did you exactly get started with spinal fluid drainage? “Within the next 3 days” means “CFD was continued for the next 3 days after the procedure”?

The reviewer thinks that because this is a single case report, more detailed information be required for readers.

Thank you.
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