

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71245

**Title:** Antegrade In Situ Laser Fenestration of Aortic Stent Graft During Endovascular Aortic Repair: A Case Report and Literature Review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04964353

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-03 05:00

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-05 10:25

**Review time:** 2 Days and 5 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting case of antegrade insitu fenestration for right renal bridging during EVAR in patient with symptomatic PAU. These my concerns to the Authors: -Description of preoperative clinical presentation and treatment should be included in a unique section, without so many subtitles. -The patient suffered ruptured AAA or symptomatic AAA, please detail this clinical aspect? -Preoperative CT should be more detailed: diameter of proximal and distal neck, diameter of aortic bifurcation, size of renal artery.....any sign of active bleeding? -Which was the rationale of using Endurant-Medtronic vs other available endografts: was the unique available graft in that moment or did you consider any particular characteristic of this graft that may improve the outcomes? -What about the oversize? -Procedure duration? amount of contrast used? -Any post-operative (even transient) renal damage? -as to the selection of renal stent, why did you choose a self exp graft? Do not you think that Balloon exp graft may be better in order to obtain an adequate flaring? - Check the legends of Fig 2 and fig 3 (they were probably inverted)  
Table 2: add the columns for technical success rate and clinical outcomes.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71245

**Title:** Antegrade In Situ Laser Fenestration of Aortic Stent Graft During Endovascular Aortic Repair: A Case Report and Literature Review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02664735

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-01 20:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-08 11:24

**Review time:** 6 Days and 14 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a case report of an antegrade in situ fenestration of an aortic stent-graft using laser. The authors have also performed a literature review. General comments: The case is interesting and well-written. I have only minor comments. The main issue is to better explain the technique that the authors used to orientate the sheath and perform the fenestration. Minor English revision is required. Title: Ok Abstract/Core tip: Change the word “noval” with “novel”. Introduction: OK Case report: - Please change ‘biochemistries’ with ‘biochemistry’ - Change “endoleakage” with “endoleak” throughout the text. - “as early as possible”. Please define the time frame (12h, 24h, 2 days?) - Please report details (type, brand name) of the laser fiber. - “Mustang” not “Mustung” - The authors should better explain how they performed real-time guidance for fenestration (2 different projections? specific landmarks, etc.) Figures: The legends for Figs 2 and 3 are inversed. Please correct.