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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article on Spontaneous coronary artery dissection its presentation, diagnosis and management. My comments are below:

1. Need to add more information on conditions associated with SCAD (FMD, collagen vascular diseases, hypothyroidism, chronic inflammatory disorders and Genetic factors). While this is mentioned briefly in the manuscript, it is worth expanding on this topic.

2. In the introduction section, paragraph 2, MRI is mentioned as one of the diagnostic tests. Can the authors expand on what findings are specific for SCAD in MRI? Also need a reference for this statement.

3. In the section on epidemiology and pathogenesis, 3rd paragraph - authors discuss iatrogenic catheter induced dissection as a cause of SCAD. This is misleading as by definition this is not SCAD.

4. In the diagnostic testing section, intracoronary imaging section, authors did not mention another pitfall of intracoronary imaging as it requires instrumentation of the coronary artery and in SCAD this poses a challenge.

5. It is worth including OCT or IVUS pictures of SCAD for visual representation.

6. Can discuss any available data on how to follow up these patients.

7. Need to include role of CABG in SCAD patients for completion.

8. SCAD can present with cardiogenic shock and this needs to be reviewed with its management.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is interesting and well-written, however, there are several issues that need to be addressed: 1. There are too many repetitions of SCAD risk factors and lacks of organization and summary. 2. The introduction of prognosis is a superficial, and it would be better to introduce studies related to the difference in prognosis of different treatment regimens. 3. Current developments and future prospects about SCAD are essential for this review, please add them as a separate paragraph before the Conclusions.