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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review this article. This article from China summarizes the treatment experience of 331 patients with aortic dissection. After reading the full text carefully, I have the following questions.

1. You were divided into four groups according to the number of WBCs before the operation. Why did you only compare the first group and the fourth group in the end, and you used the average of the four groups to compare, and what method was used, the P value can only represent the difference between the groups. Or does it represent the difference between groups 1 and 4?

2. According to your data in Table 1, even for aortic dissection patients in Group 4, more than 30% of patients still fail to undergo emergency surgery. Why do these patients not undergo emergency surgery? Is conservative treatment given to the chronic phase?

3. The difference between CPB times in Table 2 is statistically significant. Why is there no including clamping time? Is the difference not significant? Can raw data be provided to magazines?

4. P value expression may need to be modified?

5. Ask professional companies or English-speaking professionals to polish their voices
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