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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript entitled "Wine cup stoma anastomosis after extended sleeve lobectomy for central-type squamous cell lung cancer: a case report" was reviewed. The authors describe an interesting, though not novel, technique to address the challenging scenario of significant size discrepancy whenever an extended sleeve lobectomy is considered. I think the paper is well written and the message is clear. I have some suggestions aimed to improve the text and possibly increased the interest of the readership of JCTS.

1) In "Case Presentation" section, I suggest the authors include the PFT results since they mention severe emphysema based solely on CT scan findings.

2) In the same section, there is no description of the surgical approach used by the authors to perform the extended sleeve lobectomy. Incision, muscle-flap reinforcement or not...

3) Still in "Case Presentation", I suggest the authors provide information on the postoperative course, such as complications, LOS, need for toilette bronchoscopy...

4) Page 6, line 18 there is a typo "bronshi" vs bronchi;

5) In "Discussion and Conclusions" section, 2nd paragraph, the authors mention "The first two techniques may result in stenosis or obstruction of the anastomosis, mainly because of the surgeons' lack of experience with the technique." There is no citation on that, so I assume this statement is based on the authors' experience. Can you further clarify in the text?

6) I am not sure how relevant Figure 4 is. I suggest adding further pictures of the CT, more representative of the extension of the tumor (coronal view, 3D reconstruction), versus just adding a histology picture of a squamous cell carcinoma. May be a postoperative CT scan would be more informative as well.
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