Reviewer’s report

Title: Increased risk for the development of postoperative severe hypoxemia in obese women with acute type A aortic dissection

Version: 0  Date: 02 Mar 2019

Reviewer: Mate Petricevic

Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors

Thank you for submitting this article to the Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery. I was pleased to receive it as a reviewer.

1) Objectives of the study and importance of the research question

This study aimed to identify the risk factors for postoperative severe hypoxemia after surgery for acute type A aortic dissection.

Hypoxemia after surgery for aortic dissection remains to be very important research question. The idea is not new and innovative as the same Institution already published some research results on the very similar if not the same topic.

Also, the topic has already been well researched and the data of the very similar study groups have already been published. Thus, this is not innovativestudy addressing some research topic that has not been already researched. I also don't see something intriguing in this, let's say so another view on known topic.

2) Methods:

This is a single centre retrospective observational study with 112 patients included into analysis. The following sentence "Patients were recruited on a consecutive basis on the condition that they agreed to provide their informed consent." remains unclear. How were patients or their relatives consented for retrospective study?? Authors need to clarify this.

Also, the total number of recruited patients raises my concerns on the sample size effect. Did authors do sample size calculation? Sample size effect should not be underestimated.

3) Results and conclusion: results of study are listed concisely. However, the discussion and conclusion are somewhat blurry and too general.
I'm afraid that this article does not add to the current knowledge. Larger sample trials are indeed needed to elucidate some important questions in the field of acute dissection surgery.

Authors selected interesting topic. Unfortunately, I think that this paper in its present form does not add to the current knowledge.
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