

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 72245

Title: Spontaneous dissection of proximal left main coronary artery in a healthy adolescent presenting with syncope: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04159375

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-16 11:00

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-21 11:37

Review time: 5 Days

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 statements	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

This reviewer thinks that this case is rare and very interesting. Its clinical manifestation may afflict physicians. Thus, this case report would be also educative for general physicians as well as cardiologists. However, this reviewer has several concerns about this case report. Major: 1. Line 91 Please describe the race in detail. Which kind of race? Exercised at all-out intensity? 2. Did the stent cover the entire dissected segment without crossover the bifurcation? Please explain it in the procedural section. 3. Why did not you perform catheter or coronary CTA on admission despite the typical ischemic change in ECG, LV dysfunction in UCG, and troponin positive result? What was your diagnosis on admission and what did you do for 15 h after admission? 4. Please discuss about what were the differences between this case and the other two LMT spontaneous dissection cases. Why dissection sopped within the LMT ? Minor: 1. Line 79 and may has a unique clinical feature→may have? 2. Line 87 “18 h history of syncope” Meaning is ambiguous. Please correct this description. 3. Line 97 “The patient had no cardiovascular risk factors and was taking no oral medications at the time. ” This sentence should not be included in this paragraph. 4. Figure 3A The frame showing the most narrow should be presented. Longitudinal view covering the entire LMT would be helpful to know the range of spontaneous dissection 5. Figures 5 A and B Please indicate the dedicated site with the arrows (difference between A and B) 6. Figure 5 C Please explain the difference between WT and Mut in red and yellow parts with arrows.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 72245

Title: Spontaneous dissection of proximal left main coronary artery in a healthy adolescent presenting with syncope: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03496799

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-21 02:42

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-01 20:47

Review time: 11 Days and 18 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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
statements**

Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this case report, entitled “Spontaneous dissection of proximal left main coronary artery in a healthy adolescent presenting with syncope: A case report” , the authors described a 16-year-old girl with spontaneous coronary dissection in whom a mutation in the ETHE1 gene was found. This case report of adolescent was important and interesting. This reviewer has several comments as follows: 1.The manuscript had much redundant information. The authors need to focus on adolescent presentation and the paper needs to be concise and clear. 2.It would be interesting if authors could provide the details about pre-interventional intravascular ultrasound (IVUS) image. Was the IVUS findings used to guide percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI)? 3.In this case report, the authors focused on the adolescence in spontaneous coronary dissection and reviewed previous case reports. It would be great if the authors could discuss about the differences between the adolescent group and the others in detail. 4.In the legend of figure 2 in page 12, the description of ‘aortic root aortography using a pigtail catheter’ is not corresponding to the image A in which selective left coronary angiography was performed.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 72245

Title: Spontaneous dissection of proximal left main coronary artery in a healthy adolescent presenting with syncope: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04159375

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-03 11:14

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-05 05:32

Review time: 1 Day and 18 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statementsConflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors responded to my suggestions adequately. I would like to recommend two minor corrections as follows. 1) Line 90 revised manuscript exhaustion during a race.→ during a running race? (Please clarify the exercise mode) 2) I meant that “The patient had no cardiovascular risk factors and was taking no oral medications at the time.” should be described in History of past illness section. Comment 8: Line 97 “The patient had no cardiovascular risk factors and was taking no oral medications at the time.” This sentence should not be included in this paragraph. Response: Thank you very much. This sentence has been deleted as suggested (Page 3 Line 96).