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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to check your article. There have been quite a lot of studies on perioperative hypoxemia in patients with aortic dissection, and the treatment of NO has also proven to be an effective treatment. So I have a few questions:

1. In the process of data analysis, you used the statistical method of propensity score, but from the relevant data in Table 1, although the number of patients enrolled in the two groups is quite different, the baseline data is still balanced. Why did you adopt PSM this way later?

2. In Table 1, there was no statistical difference between the extracorporeal circulation time and the blocking time during the operation. There was only a difference between the deep and low temperature times, but the mean value was only 2 min. I expressed doubts about this data, so please provide the magazine with you. Raw data of the study, again subject to statistical review.

3. The most important thing is that from Tables 1 and 2, the baseline data of patients before and 24 hours after surgery is basically the same, but you did not accurately describe the criteria for enrollment, why only 40 of 174 patients used iNo Treatment, what is the reason?
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