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Reviewer’s report:

General

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. In the title and throughout the manuscript, this new longer microdebrider blade is being labeled as “tracheal”, however, the main purpose of this blade is to use it in the bronchi. The author should remove the adjective “tracheal” from the name.
2. The author should give more details on the new blade: diameter, angled or straight tip, and smooth or serrated blade. Additionally, the mode (oscillating, reverse, or forward) and the speed (RPM) used during the case should be specified.
3. In page 5, line 8: two additional modalities for treatment of airway obstruction are not mentioned: brachytherapy and photodynamic therapy. They should be included for the sake of completion.
4. The author should comment on whether bleeding occurred during or after the debridement process with the microdebrider in this patient.
5. The author should comment on possible disadvantages of the microdebrider:
   a. The impact of this device on bleeding and whether a coagulation modality is needed prior to using the microdebrider to prevent bleeding
   b. The possibility of debriding through normal tissue if care is not taken
   c. The need for another modality of mechanical debridement in order to obtain tissue for submission to pathology

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Page 3, line 2: “Microdebrider bronchoscopy” is an incorrect term. It should say something like “The microdebrider is a new bronchoscopic tool….”
2. Page 3, line 12: “T2M2N1” is incorrect and does not correlate with the abstract
3. Page 3, line 17: “lower lower”; probably meant to say “left lower”
4. Page 4, line 17: The author should mention whether the used metal stent was covered or uncovered

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
