Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals
Volume 13 · Issue 2 · e127396

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Surgical Reconstruction of Valsalva Sinus Aneurysms: One Surgical Team Outcomes from Tertiary Center

Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel, Seyed Sadegh Zargarnataj, Hadi Abo Aljadayel, Bahador Baharestani, Maziar Gholampour Dehaki, Ziae Totonchi

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15 May 2022 | 28 Sep 2022 | 17 Oct 2022 | 10.5812/mca-127396 |

## About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

## Contents

1 **Original submission** Editor-in-Chief ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor ..... 3
Authors' reply to reviewers ..... 4
Reviewer and editor comments ..... 6
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief ..... 7
Authors' reply to reviewers ..... 8
Reviewer and editor comments ..... 10

## 1 Original submission

1 comment · 28 May 2022

### Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 28 May 2022

Dear Authors,
Thank you for sharing your experience.
Please note that your article should be revised based on the associate editor's comments before the final decision.
Regards

2

# Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

## > Associate Editor's Comments:

*Associate Editor 1:*
*Dear authors, congratulations with your excellent results. This study is a case series as a retrospective cohort study. It is essential to describe the basic difference or concordance of your data with published reports in the literature to add something new to scientific knowledge . My suggestions: 1.operative techniques should be described precisely with more details.*
*2. Creating a table to show the patients characteristics is recommended.*
*3. In abstract section, background should include definition of disease or challenging issues.(our surgical team ……. Is the method not background)*
*4.mid-term result instead of moderate*
*5.22 (53%) of patients instead of 22 patient 53%*
*6.20 patient is 47.6% not 71.42%*
*7. Capitalization needs major revision ( in somewhere you typed vsd and in other lines VSD)*
*8. Spacing needs revision: for ex: likehood instead of like hood*
*9. Punctuation needs to be corrected.*
*10. Keywords have been typed doubly*
*11. First phrase of introduction can be replaced with: Sinus of valsalva aneurysm is an uncommon cardiac anomaly. It can be congenital or acquired.*
*12. Line 33 : no parenthesis*
*13.Transesophageal without space*
*14. Tertiary University hospital instead of shahid Rajaee*
*15.line 49. Omit then*
*16. For time period of study there is no need to mention the days , month is fine*
*17.line63. Operative approach was through the heart chambers which contained rupture*
*18. Line 70: sinuses instead of sinus*
*19. Line 75 . Were closed instead of closed*
*20. Line 86 .most patients were men(34 vs 8)*
*21. Line 87. Omit included*
*22.line93: including 20 AVR and 8 AV repair*
*23. Line 103 .: were instead of wewe*
*24. Line 121 :Intra-operative TEE revealed instead of sentence*
*25. Line124: leading to death instead of “which cause one of them to die”*
*26. Line 147 : given instead of according*
*27. Line 148 ; sentence in not correct grammatically*
*28. Line 157: sentence is not correct grammatically*
*29. Line 164 : mandates instead of necessitate*
*30. Line 170: conversely is no appropriate*
*31. Line 182: direct suture closure instead of suturing*
*32. Line 185 . 4-5 mm*
*33. Line 186 : healthy instead of normal*
*34. Line 191: selecting instead of choosing*

We couldn’t find specific result or something new in our series cases

1- Operative techniques were written with more details.
2- Table 1 demographic characters and table 4(Involved sinus of valsalva), 5(Type of Aneurysm) were added and sited in the article.
3- Introduction has been changed
4- We changed to mid-term
5- We changed to recommended form.
6- It has been corrected
7- We corrected the capitalization in line 163
8- We revised all
9- Punctuation corrected when needed.
10-corrected
11-the sentence is changed
12-We deleted the parenthesis
13-corrected
14-corrected
15-omitted
16-Days have been deleted
17-The sentence changed
18- Corrected
19- corrected
20- corrected
21- Omitted
22- The sentence changed
23- corrected
24-We changed the sentence
25-We changed the sentence
26-We changed to given
27-The sentence in lines 147 -148 had been corrected
28-The sentence in lines 157-159 corrected
29-Changed to mandates.
30- Its changed to less.
31-Its corrected
32-Its corrected
33-Its corrected
34-Its changed

## 2 Revision 1

1 comment · 1 Sep 2022

### Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 1 Sep 2022

Dear authors, congratulations on the excellent result in this cohort of patients with sinus of Valsalva aneurysm. Follow-up is crucial, and you have conducted it precisely. My suggestion: regarding scientific writing in English, this manuscript needs to be edited by an expert. Below are some of my suggestions:
1. In the background section of the abstract: single center instead of "one center".
2. sinus of Valsalva instead of "sinus valsalva" (also, in some paragraphs, the abbreviation has been used, and in others, the full name; after the abbreviation is first defined, it should be used throughout).
3. Patients' condition, anatomic characteristics, or features instead of "situation".
4. "On the other hand" is informal. Furthermore is the formal substitute.
5. "So" is informal. Thus is the formal substitute.
6. University Hospital or tertiary center instead of "Shahid Raja. . .. . .".
7. Line 64: omit "for".
8. Line 65: operative technique instead of this sentence: "herby we mention . . .. . .. . .".
9. The conclusion paragraph of the abstract is ill-defined. Which theory has been proved? It needs revision.
10. Surgical note: the operative technique, including incision, cannulation, and myocardial preservation techniques, should be in the first paragraph.
11. In line 209, the sentence is not grammatically correct.
12. In line 210: delete “usage”.
13. In line 214: delete “even if”.
14. Line 216: delete “in this category of patients”.
15. Line 223: delete “and”.
16. Line 224: aortic valve surgery, predominantly valve replacement.
I hope these suggestions will be helpful.

3

# Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

*Dear authors, congratulation for the excellent result in this cohort of patients with sinus of valsalva aneurysm, follow up is crucial which you have done precisely. My suggestion: regarding english scientific writing, this manuscript needs to be edited by an expert. Below are some of my suggestions:*
*1. In the background section of the abstract: single center instead of one center*
*2.sinus of valsalva instead of sinus valsalva( also in some paragraphs , the abbreviation have been used and in some the full name,after first definition of abbreviation, all then it should be used)*
*3.patients condition or anatomic characteristics or feature instead of situation*
*4.On the other hand is informal.Furthermore is the formal substitute*
*5.So is informal. Thus is the formal substitute*
*6.university Hospital or tertiary center instead of Shahid Raja……*
*7.line 64: omit for*
*8. Line65: opertive technique instead of this sentence:herby we mention …….*
*9. conclusion paragraph of abstract is ill-defined , which theory has been proved? It needs revision*
*10. Surgical note: the operative technique including incision cannulation myocardial preservation techniques should be in the first paragraph.*
*11. In line 209. The sentence is not correct grammatically*
*12. In line 210. Delete "usage"*
*13. In line 214: delete "even if"*
*14. Line216: delete "in this category of patients*
*15. Line223: delete "and"*
*16. Line224 : aortic valve surgery predominantly valve replacement.*
*Wish these suggestion be helpful*

## ***asnswers***

*1- replaced*

*2- corrected*

*3- corrected*

*4- replaced in line 38*

*5- replaced*

*6- changed*

*7- omitted*

*8- changed*

*9-we revised the conclusion paragraph in the abstract*

*10- we added paragraph about cannulation and protection*

*11- the sentence has been revised*

*12- deleted*

*13- deleted*

*14- deleted*

*15- deleted*

*16- corrected*

## 3 Revision 2

1 comment · 17 Oct 2022

### Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 17 Oct 2022

Dear corresponding author,
Thank you for the revision.
The article will be published after English editing in the upcoming issue.

Regards
EIC