

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hypertension

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14340

**Title:** Diagnosis and management of thoracic aortic dissection: An update

**Reviewer's code:** 00039411

**Reviewer's country:** Argentina

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-01 10:58

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-15 12:14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It's an interesting review of this disease, but I found some results a little confusing. Comparison between treatments and results is not very clear. Some figures or tables would be useful.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hypertension

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14340

**Title:** Diagnosis and management of thoracic aortic dissection: An update

**Reviewer's code:** 00227375

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-01 10:58

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-04 17:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[ Y ] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a systematic review about diagnosis and management of aortic dissection. Though this manuscript is nicely structured and well written, several minor mistakes remained in this manuscript. I'm afraid the references lack accuracy. Please consider the following comments. (Comments) 1. References References are not allowed in the instructions to authors. In addition, I think the references lack accuracy. No. 23, 24 and 25 lack in particular. No. 9 is the same as No.18. For example [23] Golledge J, Eagle KA. Acute aortic dissection. Lancet 2008; 372: 55-66 [24] Shiga T, Wajima Z, Apfel CC, Inoue T, Ohe Y. Arch Intern Med 2006; 166: 1350-1356 [25] Svensson LG, Crawford ES, Hess KR, Coselli JS, Safi HJ. Variables predictive of outcome in 832 patients undergoing repairs of the descending thoracic aorta. Chest 1993; 104: 1248-1253 2. Page 2, Definition, line 6 Correct "(Booher et al., 2013)" to "[4]"

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hypertension

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14340

**Title:** Diagnosis and management of thoracic aortic dissection: An update

**Reviewer's code:** 02633299

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-01 10:58

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-13 05:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[ Y ] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Benson RA, Loftus IM present an update for Diagnosis and Management of Aortic Dissection. It is interesting article in which the latest knowledges are to find. Therefore, this article should publish.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hypertension

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14340

**Title:** Diagnosis and management of thoracic aortic dissection: An update

**Reviewer's code:** 00505468

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-01 10:58

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-13 15:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This a brief but complete overview on the current management of Aortic Dissections. My comments are the following: 1. This paper could be further benefited from two missing references: Fattori R et al. JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2013;8:876 Nienaber C et al. Circ Cardiovasc Interv 2013;6:326 2. I would suggest the authors to include what is known in the literature regarding the abdominal aortic dissection as the title of this work as it stands should cover also this topic.