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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions:

1. Page 6, line 23: How did the nurse(s) determine the presence or absence of laryngospasm?

2. Page 6, line 32: If the patient received an additional bolus of propofol, was this considered a "failure3?"

3. Page 7, line 19: The definitions of view grades 1 - 4 do not make sense. Traditionally a grade such as this should progress from "best to worst" or from "most to least" as the numbers go from 1 - 4.

4. Table 3: The asterisk footnote does not make sense. It is defined as a significant difference from baseline, yet in each case it is positioned in the same row as "Baseline."

Table 5: Please add the statistical tests used to the table legend. Please add "1" to the definition on view grade 1.

Figure 4: For consistency with Figures 3 and 4, please change "dose" in the x-axis label to "concentration."

Figures 1 - 4: Please supply figure legends.

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: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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