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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting report that looks at the effectiveness of bronchoscopic balloon dilatation and topical application of Mitomycin-C in a rare case of multilevel tracheobronchial stenosis due to endobronchial tuberculosis. It is a well written manuscript focusing on a topic with few data available in literature.

I only have minor comments to discuss:

Minor comments:

1. I suggest inserting "bronchoscopic balloon dilatation" in the Title. This would point out the importance of both procedures (balloon dilatation and Mitomycin-C application) in resolving the stenoses. Because no randomized controlled trials are present in literature, it is unclear whether the addition of topical Mitomycin-C might further improve and prolong the endoscopic balloon efficacy in restoring the airway patency in benign tracheobronchial stenosis.

2. It is unclear whether the Authors decided to treat the patient with further 9 months anti-TB therapy. At the time of the first endoscopic examination they only noticed a web-like tracheal stenosis without any reported microbiological/molecular diagnosis of active TB.

3. Discussion Section: I suggest further highlighting the peculiarity of their report in the context of medical literature (rare multiple level tracheobronchial stenosis due to endobronchial TB, few reports available on this topic, uncommon persistent airway patency secondary to bronchoscopic treatment, ecc.).

4. References Section: in the reference number 17, the journal name is missing
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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