Mid-term results of abdominal endovascular aneurysm repair
Abdominal aort anevrizmalarının endovasküler tamirinde orta dönem sonuçlar
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Dear Editor,

I read the article by Yazman et al.[1] with great interest and would like to address into certain issues. Although the title of the article reflects mid-term results, the authors reported that there was no significant difference in the quality of life in the long-term in the Results section.

In the Abstract section, 203 patients were reported to suffer from a ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm. However, there are only 12 patients with a ruptured aneurysm, as mentioned in the manuscript, while the remaining patients had non-ruptured aneurysms.

In addition, the study compared two groups of patient, endovascular aneurysm repair versus open surgery with regard to mortality and quality of life, as mentioned in the Abstract. However, neither the open surgery group, nor any comparison of mortality and quality of life are available.

Finally, in the last paragraph of the manuscript, the following conclusion statement is written: “In conclusion, shorter operation time, shorter intensive care unit and hospital stays, shorter recovery period, lesser units of blood transfusion necessity, and lower early period mortality and morbidity rates are the main advantages of endovascular aortic repair over open surgery.” However, it is not clear on which data were used to build such a conclusive statement.
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