

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_112751
Title of the Manuscript:	Atypical Presentation of Aortic Dissection: A Call for Vigilance in Chest Pain Diagnosis
Type of the Article	Case report

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>I read this article many times carefully and so I can say : in my experience I had a case of Acute Aortic Dissection who presented with chest pain and ST depression in EKG who treated with the diagnosis of Acute Myocardial infarction and received streptokinase and later in echocardiography revealed : intimal flap in ascending aorta .But this is a known diagnostic mistake and it was written and emphasized in all text books .I want to ask the writer of this article .what do you mean of "unusual presentation " ? Do you mean the unusual chest pain ? Unusual EKG finding ? Unusual auscultatory finding? Besides the main problem that I said also The echocardiographic findings wasn't explained completely. it was not why the patient was candidate for bental operation and not supracoronary replacement. My recommendation is : This article needs complete revision and re- writing but after revision , may be it will be suitable for publish.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zahra Ansari Aval
Department, University & Country	Rajaie Cardiovascular Medical and Research Institute, Iran