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**Reviewer's report:**

This is the study about the efficacy and safety of the sugammadex and neostigmine for reverse against the moderate neuromuscular blockade by rocuronium in Chinese and Caucasian subjects.

I'm impressed that this paper is well designed study. The body text of the paper is well described. The methods and results sections are very detailed and easy to understand. Discussion is concisely summarized with appropriate references.

<Major concerns>
I'd like to recommend some major concerns for improvement your manuscripts as follows;

1. There is no detailed descriptions about the anesthesia methods.
2. If you used the propofol as a main anesthesia, which drugs would be used as an adjunctive analgesics (ex, remifentanil, fentanyl, morphine etc.). Is there are any difference in frequency or doses of opioids between groups?
3. Which body weight scale do you use for dosing the sugammadex or neostigmine? (ideal body weight / real body weight / lean body mass)
4. There is no exceptional criteria for BMI (body mass index). This is an important point in related with above #3 and it can affect the postoperative residual curarization even after using sugammadex.

<Minor concerns>
I'd like to recommend some minor concerns for improvement your manuscripts as follows;

1. Title of the manuscript may be inappropriate for summarizing your work. In this study, all reversal were done at moderate depth of blockade. More clear title should be needed.
2. In the "Introduction" section, the purpose of this study, some phrases are duplicated inappropriately. It would be better to describe shortly and concisely.
3. In the "Methods" section, Efficacy analyses, if the time to recovery of the TOF > 0.9 was more than 6 min in the Sugammadex group, they would be classed as
a prolonged recovery time. How many patients would be finally? and what is the cause of prolonged recovery?

Thank you for the submission of interesting manuscript.
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