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Reviewer's report:

The authors reported surgical results of double aortic arch with 24 cases.

My comments are as below:

This manuscript includes many misuse of medical terms such as the arterial catheter which probable means ductus arteriosus. The others are "anti-infection"...and so on. The authors should ask English editors to edit their manuscript.

Vascular rings or double aortic arch generally needs infant repair and patient age are around 3 to 6 months. The patient needs to be sedated with tracheal intubation during cardiac CT, so PEEP are given to all patients. The PEEP usually alleviates tracheal stenosis, so it is always difficult to assess the degree of stenosis if PEEP is adjusted for example, taking CT with PEEP 0 and PEEP 8. I think the authors should give more details for evaluation of tracheal stenosis for follow-up periods, otherwise, their data are not reliable as the PEEP can be differently done to patients in each CT.

The one of airway symptoms of vascular ring or double aortic arch is NOT "ASTHMA".

Conclusion should be summarized more shortly. The authors mention irrelevant contexts to the result of their study.
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