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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-conducted randomized controlled trial to compare "Rusch intubation stylet facilitated NG tube insertion" to conventional blind insertion. According to the data presented, this simple but innovative method can significantly increase the first attempt success rate without increasing procedure related complications. This method may significantly improve current clinical practice without increasing medical expense.

Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Generally yes. But there are some concerns the authors should further address. (Major Compulsory Revisions)
1. Why choose neutral position? The angle between nasopharyngeal axis and pharyngeal axis is greater when the patient's head is in neutral position than in sniffing position.
2. The stiffness of "Rusch stylet-NG tube apparatus" is greater than NG tube alone. What is the curvature of the stylet when performing NG tube insertion? Is there a manual bending necessary?
3. How to overcome the anatomic angle from nasopharyngeal axis to pharyngeal axis? What is the maneuver needed when encountering resistance passing the angle during insertion?

Are the data sound?
Yes

Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Generally yes. But there are some points the authors should further discuss.
1. Besides nasal mucosal bleeding, what is the incidence of nasopharyngeal mucosa trauma in this trial (Major Compulsory Revisions)?
2. Are there any supplemental data available? Such as patients satisfaction and minor discomforts for example post-operative sore throat and nasal pain? (Discretionary Revisions)

Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes

Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes.

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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