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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript. The authors are to be congratulated for the interesting submission but I have several concerns that I am going to report.

The Guardian Laryngeal Mask is not easy to be found on the Web, and the company manufacturing the device has limited internet based. I could not retrieve any image of the device.

The study presented was registered at clinicaltrial.gov and a similar study was conducted in Austria and completed in 2012 with a full publication A randomised, non-crossover study of the GuardianCPV™ Laryngeal Mask versus the LMA Supreme™ in paralysed, anaesthetised female patients.

W. Tiefenthaler Consultant1,*, S. Eschertzhuber Associate Professor1, J. Brimacombe Professor2, E. Fricke Registered Nurse2, C. Keller Associate Professor3 and M. Kaufmann Consultant1 Article first published online: 1 APR 2013. DOI: 10.1111/anae.12178

Over 120 randomized subjects included the authors could not find any relevant difference between Guardian and Supreme. Assuming that ProSeal is supposed to be even better than Supreme, the findings presented by Pajiyar et al. is compelling.

The introduction, background and aims are delineated clearly, however the study fails to provide a reason (other than a Product testing) on the novelty and gap of knowledge filling for the investigation.

The authors claim that the power was conducted assuming ProSeal leak pressures of X and Guardian leak pressures of Y, so I assume the power was based on the respective devices performance of leak pressure. Considering the mean and SD it seems that the two devices are simply performing the same, so the justification, clinical would be to find no difference.

In fact the devices are similar in most of features, as far I can depict from the description (no pictures are shown) and based on the experience of the reviewer (however every anesthesiologist around the world should be able to know and assess the features of the Guardian "visually").

The manuscript is for the rest solid but redundant with tables and graphics which can certainly be reduced or consolidated.

In conclusion this is a new device to standard of care comparison study, similar
to published article (which is not included in the references or cited) that is per se appropriate, it does confirms "at least" that the two devices do not majorly differed, and so GLM could be used clinically.
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