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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors report a complicated case of esophagectomy for mid-esophageal carcinoma. The treatment of serious complications such as rupture of esophagogastric anastomosis after the 1st operation, anastomotic fistula in the neck, tracheal stenosis and leak from the gastric conduit after the 2nd operation, is poorly described in the Case Presentation section of the manuscript. More details are required for the 2nd surgical intervention and for the repair of tracheal stenosis. The authors should explain the cause of dyspnea after the 2nd operation. The exact dates of surgeries (i.e May 11, June 12, August 20) are not required in a scientific manuscript. Overall the language is poor and many medical terms are not correct, making that way quite difficult my attempt to read and understand the presented case.

The more important questions to do is why the authors choose to proceed with left thoracoctomy in a middle esophagus carcinoma.
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