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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | Pseudoaneurysms (PSAs) natural history is unclear but risk for spontaneous rupture and exsanguination exists. Notably, delayed splenic PSAs can develop in any patient, and at present, there are no known risk factors that may reliably predict their occurrence. Furthermore, there is a lack of consensus regarding the most appropriate strategies for monitoring and managing splenic injuries, especially lower-grade. The yield of delayed CT Angiography for PSA diagnosis is not well delineated and optimal timing is undefined.This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it represents an example of the proper management of splenic trauma with pseudoaneurysm formation. However, this experience is based on a single patient rather than a larger sample, for which references already exist in the literature. |  |
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| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are sufficient (11 is an appropriate number for a case report). However, these references, except for the last one (Radding et al., 2024), are outdated. Although I am aware that the literature on splenic pseudoaneurysms is limited and fragmented, I recommend adding the following, to make the manuscript more current and relevant:* doi: 10.1002/wjs.12238
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