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Reviewer's report:

This is a relatively straightforward randomized trial comparing the Guardian LMA (GLMA) with the LMA ProSeal (PLMA) in 80 adult patients. Primary endpoint was airway seal pressures. Secondary endpoints include insertion success rates, speed of insertion of the device, speed of gastric tube placement, and overall complication rates. The authors have found the GLMA was associated with higher airway seal pressures with faster rates of insertion of the device as well as the gastric tube. In its current form, the paper is excessively wordy and could benefit from reduction in the overall manuscript make it a more succinct and to the point manuscript, particularly in the methods and discussion sections.

Major Compulsory Revisions

• The Guardian LMA has been compared to the LMA supreme in 120 female patients W. Tiefenthaler Anaesthesia. 2013 Jun;68:600-4. A randomised, non-crossover study of the Guardian CPV Laryngeal Mask versus the LMA Supreme in paralysed, anaesthetised female patients. These authors have demonstrated that The Guardian LMA was associated with higher Airways leak pressures than the LMA Supreme. The current authors should incorporate this reference into the manuscript and discuss this paper in relation to their results.

• The abstract should include the primary and secondary outcomes for this study as the authors have in the introduction or a specific hypotheses being tested.

• In randomized trials, baseline demographic data should not be subjected to statistical comparison, since it is already known that the subjects were randomly allocated and that any difference is therefore due to chance. Please confirm with journal preference.

• Avoid repetition of the Results and the Tables: if presented in the Tables, please do not repeat the same information in the text.

• The authors have repeated to several of their results in the discussion which is very distracting. Please eliminate results where applicable in the Discussion. The Discussion in its current form is unduly long. I believe it can be cut down by 20% and be more to the point. Suggest: first paragraph talk about the main findings of their study. The remaining paragraphs should talk about what has been shown and how the results are similar and/or different to other investigations on this topic. The authors have done this in some way, but I believe this can be sharpened and more focused. I would suggest the following order for the Discussion: State main findings, how do they fit in with previous studies: Why are
they different / same. What information adds to knowledge of subject, weaknesses in study and conclusions (should be less than 1000 words)

• There are excessive amounts of figures please choose one figure that accurately represents the goal of the study. Alternatively, it may not be necessary to add all these figures and simple tables may be sufficient to make it easier for the reader to appreciate the differences between devices for the tested outcomes. There is also excessive repetition of the results and existing tables where. I would suggest wherever it is possible to create a table please do so and eliminate the words / description in the Results section to make it more succinct manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions
• Please run manuscript through a spell check

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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