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Dear Editor,

This letter accompanies the submission of a revised manuscript presenting the original article entitled: Mid-term results of wrapping of the dilated ascending aorta, MS: 8530561861756783.

Thank you for consideration of publication of our manuscript in your Journal. The reviewers suggested several changes to the manuscript and language editing. We followed the suggestions and addressed all the comments in the revised manuscript. Moreover, the manuscript was edited by a native speaker.

Reviewer: Oved Cohen

Dear Dr. Cohen,

Thank You for all the comments. We found them very valuable. We followed your suggestions and believe that they will improve our manuscript.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

I find the methods are well described but not well presented. I suggest the authors to improve the paper presentation with more pre op demographic, intraoperative and postoperative data organized in tables, as well as the schematic description of the wrapping procedure to be a more professional.

The pre op demographic, intraoperative and postoperative have been transferred to the tables. The schematic description of the procedure might seem to be too basic. However, we believe that thanks to the simplicity of the graphical presentation it may be easier to understand the basics of the procedure. We would like to leave it in an unchanged form. Would it be acceptable?

There is not sufficient reference to the technical issues of applying the wrapping materials such as:
Was the procedure performed on bypass or off bypass? How did the aorta was dissected from the tissues around it?
The procedure was performed on bypass. The description of the dissection of the aorta has been added.

Are there any pitfalls and recommendation to how to do this very gentle dissection?
A suggestion how to perform the dissection has been added (the use of CPB and avoiding performing wrapping on a calcified aorta)

What are the anatomical borders to this dissection? where there any complications during applying the wrap?
The anatomical borders of the dissection have been added. There were no complications when applying the wrap.

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
It is very dull discussion that refers mostly to the data of this manuscript without discussing the subject in general and with relating to the many studies that previously deal with this matter.
A reference to other studies presenting the results of wrapping of the aorta has been added.

I would expect the authors to discuss with more details the isolated wrapping cases the right timing for the procedure etc.
A discussion about the isolated wrapping technique as well as the possible best timing of the procedure has been added.

Minor Essential Revisions
The manuscript is written in a basic language and I would suggest that the authors will be assist by an English speaking editor to enrich the language of the manuscript.
The text has been additionally edited by a native speaker.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Reviewer: Raimund Erbel

Dear Prof. Erbel,
Thank you for your valuable comments. We addressed all of them in our manuscript. We believe that they will improve the quality of our manuscript.

Reviewer’s report

In the introduction, one sentence should deal with the history of the technique well known since many years.
A short description of the history of the technique was added.
The description of the methods is too short and very superficial. More information is needed. How did the authors measure the aortic diameter before, during and after the surgery? The results are not sufficient in relation to the data needed. What were diameters before and after the procedure? CT data, echo data, MRI? What were the results after the follow-up? Did the authors control the results by echo, CT or MRI?

The diameter of the ascending aorta was measured using CT-angiography and transthoracic echo before the procedure and with the use of transthoracic echo during the follow-up. The diameters presented in the manuscript refer to the transthoracic echo measurements.

Using a follow-up time of one and a half year is a short and not mid-term follow-up which is needed in aortic patients anyway.

The title has been changed to “Single center experience with wrapping of the ascending aorta”. Moreover, the expression “mid-term” has been changed to “short-term” in the manuscript.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

The text has been additionally edited by a native speaker.

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

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours faithfully,

Tomasz Plonek