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**Title:** straight aortic endograft in abdominal aortic disease

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 18 December 2012

**Reviewer:** Fabio Pozzi-Mucelli

**Reviewer's report:**

Reviewer's report: minor essential revisions  
Abstract: ok  
Text  
Introduction  
“Historically, the first endovascular repair…of an abdominal aortic aneurysm”  
I suggest to add “in the western world” because as shown at the last Charing Cross Congress the first to do an endovascular aorta repair was a Russian vascular surgeon in 1987 (Nicholas Volodov).

**Revision was made as suggested**

Methods  
Please specify which angiographic equipment was used (mobile C arm? Fixed angio-suite? Flat panel technology?).  
Did you use a percutaneous or surgical approach?  
There are some abbreviations as “ET”, “POD”, “OSR” which are not written in the extended form the first time they appear.  
While the authors explain which device they use for group B, this is not explained for group A

**Revision was made as suggested**

Results  
Please explain why you decided to reintervene for the stent fracture. Which was the symptom?

**Revision was made as suggested**

Discussion  
Please correct “cover stent” with “covered stent” (specify which covered stent you have deployed).

**Revision was made as suggested**
Conclusions: ok
References: ok
Tables
Table 2: I'm impressed by the low amount of contrast media: are you sure that the total amount is correct?
Yes, it is.

Figures
No figures were included. However I believe that an example of “thrombone technique” and one example of “single straight tube” could be included.

Two figures were added as suggested.
Reviewer conclusions:
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? Yes, I think this paper is original
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? Some improvement may be done, as previously suggested
3. Are the data sound and well controlled? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
7. Is the writing acceptable? Yes. Only minor revisions are needed. I suggest to accept and publish.
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