

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71516

Title: Successful treatment of aortic dissection with pulmonary embolism: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02636483

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FCPS, FRCP, MBBS, MD, MSc

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-10

Reviewer chosen by: Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-07 11:53

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-07 11:58

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This case report is very interesting with clinical impact on management of acute vascular emergency. It is well written with good support of pertinent references. Images are also found very nice and good quality with pertinent findings exhibited.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71516

Title: Successful treatment of aortic dissection with pulmonary embolism: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03846820

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACC, FESC, MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-10

Reviewer chosen by: Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-24 01:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-26 07:54

Review time: 2 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear author, The article represents the clinical case of successful therapy of aortic dissection with pulmonary embolism. The article is written with the acceptable English-speaking adduction of the arguments. The article is sufficiently novel and very interesting to warrant publication. All the key elements are presented and described clearly. The most discussable options in the article are: 1) Please correct all your minor grammar errors and typos. 2) The case is quite simple and not truly challenging for the daily practice. Your scenario was quite benign merely because the patient was initially stable hemodynamically and there were no indications for thrombolysis (please mention the Guidelines in the main text that you use in your routine clinical practice). It might be nice to see at least more clinical data including ECG, echo, lab results and so on (please, more numbers and justification of your clinical strategy) – we do not know even a level of the blood pressure in the pulmonary artery(!!!). Is there an overload of the right chambers? The content is simply not informative enough to draw any conclusions. I would kindly suggest also to provide a reader with the higher quality images. 3) Discussion: if you mention any other cases, why there are no references? Please, underline the novelty and your message! Frankly, I do not understand the message of your clinical case. It must be emphasized. What have we suppose to learn after reading of your article? I do not have an answer – due to lack of the critical clinical information, this case does not sound at all.