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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Iatrogenic acute type B aortic dissection during right transradial intervention in a patient with an aberrant right subclavian artery salvaged by transluminal angioplasty: A case report
This manuscript demonstrates the uncommon complication after the right transradial intervention in the patient with an aberrant right subclavian artery and the salvaged therapy for this situation. The author wrote the manuscript well, concisely, and easy to read. The demonstrated pictures are interesting. However, the authors should be commended on their work. There are a few areas where additional information would enhance the manuscript. 1. In the “abstract,” the author mentioned, “However, after 2 days, the right lower limb was suddenly undetectable”. What did it mean? 2. Author described that this patient had a history of hypertension twice (at “chief complain” and “history of past illness,” which looks redundant. 3. It would be more impressive if the author provides more information about the “physical examination.” 4. In the “treatment” section, “After two days in the ICU, the right FA pulse suddenly weakened, and the blood pressure of the right lower limb was no longer measurable.” Did the patient complain of any symptoms of limb ischemia (such as pain)? 5. Please provide the information on renal recovery after transluminal angioplasty or at the follow-up.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
A very nice case presentation. Do you think it was aggressive manipulation of the guiding catheter and wire that caused the dissection as the diagnostic catheter passed smoothly? I would recommend grammar and language revision.