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Reviewer's report:

In their retrospective study, the authors differentiate two types of IMH: IMH alone and those complicated by PAU, as reported by the authors that age significantly differed between these two sub-types, the term IMH complicated by PAU does not seem appropriate, I would rather suggest IMH and PAU-IMH association as majority of PAU are accompanied by some amount of IMH.

Should the definition of PAU mention the presence of aortic wall calcification to differentiate from intimal tear or rupture secondary to IMH?

The sample is two small to draw actual recommendation.

considering 72 CT angio cases, I suggest the authors to provide more elaborated and flourishing iconography.

What is the reason of pericardial effusion in Figure 1-B?

NA should be first mentioned as North America

Manuscript needs minor grammatical and typographic correction.

I consider its publication after minor revision.
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