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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Prof. Spadaro

We appreciate editor and reviewers very much for their constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “Determination of the optimal inspiratory pressure providing adequate ventilation while minimizing gastric insufflation using real-time ultrasonography in Chinese children: a prospective, randomized, double-blind study”. (ID: BANE-D-17-00041R2).

We have studied reviewer’s comments carefully and have made revision which marked in red in the paper. Attached please find the revised version, which we would like to submit for your kind consideration. In addition, because the first author, X. Qian has changed the job, we added the new address of him in the title page.

We would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for comments on our paper. Looking forward to hearing from you.
Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Jun Li

List of Responses

However, from the study flow-chart, the total number of randomized patients is 90, while the allocation section in the figure has 3 groups of 18 patients (so 54 patients). I may argue that authors referred to 18 patients for each of the first 3 groups (PS of 8, 10, 12 cmH20), but in this form the figure is confusing for readers who may not understand this passage and may not be able to track patients flow in the study. Please modify the CONSORT study flow chart.

Answer: Thanks for your good advice. We have modified it according to your suggestion.

The initial number of eligible patient during the study period (1 March 2016 - 1 July 2016) is the exact number of included patients (and the calculated sample size). Does it represent the number of prospectively enrolled consecutive patients or a convenience sample?

Answer: The initial number of eligible patient during the study period is the exact number of included patients (and the calculated sample size). It does not represent the number of prospectively enrolled consecutive patients or a convenience sample.

Please modify the description of figure 3 as "Study flow - chart" or "Consort study flow chart", instead of "…flow diagram of the randomization"

Answer: We have modified it according to your suggestion.

Please modify the following sentence "We think the reasons may due to the application of 100% oxygen and nearly common minute ventilation "Please consider if the following is in line with your message:" This may be explained by the administration of 100% oxygen" and by minute ventilation almost reaching normal values"
Answer: We have modified it according to your suggestion. We would like to express our great appreciation to you for your careful and excellent work.