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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This review summarizes the efforts, which have been made so far in order to replace long-segmental tracheal defects using all sorts of prosthesis. This is a well-written summary of materials tested for airway reconstruction and the work contributes to the existing literature by giving a compact overview on the matter. I congratulate the authors on this manuscript and would like to acknowledge the leading role of ENT and thoracic surgeons from the UK in the field of airway replacement. In my opinion, however, the review is not complete yet and would benefit from another round of revision. I would like to ask the authors to emphasis on recent, successful (?) concepts of airway replacement by the two French groups (Marie Lannelongue Hospital - Ann Thorac Surg. 2013 Oct;96(4):1146-55., FREGAT - Eur J Med Res. 2013 Jul 29;18:25; N Engl J Med. 2006 Nov 2;355(18):1938-40.) and the Leuven group (Delaere). To the best of my knowledge the Dartevelle/Fadel/Mussort group has used this technique for some time now and has shown acceptable long-term results. The results of the FREGAT group (using fresh and cryopreserved aortic grafts) should also be discussed in more detail. Especially the idea of cartilage regeneration in aortic grafts has been challenged by other groups independently (eg Ann Thorac Surg. 2010 Jan;89(1):253-8). Please also include the most recent
publication from the Boston airway unit (Mathisen, J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2016 Nov;152(5):1388-1397.), using aortic grafts for non-circular airway replacement. The authors should include a paragraph highlighting why tracheal replacement is so complex. I believe one of the key features is the blood supply, which is hard to address in any of the above mentioned replacement strategies. I would challenge the conclusion that silicone based prostheses have shown most promising results. To the best of my knowledge they are not used in clinical practice and the publications the authors refer to were published in the 80s. Congratulations to this work!
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**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**  
I appreciate this review. If possible, please provide the figures of various prostheses to make the reader easily understand.