Author’s response to reviews

Title: COMPARISON OF THE SUPREME™ AND PROSEAL™ LARYNGEAL MASK AIRWAYS IN INFANTS : A PROSPECTIVE RANDOMIZED CLINICAL STUDY

Authors:
Sibel Oba (sibeloba@yahoo.com)
Hacer Sebnem Turk (hacersebnem@yahoo.com.tr)
Canan Tulay Isil (cananonaldi@yahoo.com)
Hüseyin Erdogan (hsynerdgn@gmail.com)
Pinar Sayin (drpinaray@yahoo.com)
Ali Ihsan Dokucu (aidokucu@gmail.com)

Version: 1 Date: 21 Jun 2017

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thank you very much for your precious reports. We have made some changes to our manuscript as follows:

Our manuscript underwent language checking, Enago letter is attached.

Reviewer reports:

Neerja Bhardwaj, MD (Reviewer 1): A well written manuscript. It would have been worthwhile to mention the number of failures of PLMA or Supreme insertions.
Dear Dr. Neerja Bhardwaj,

Thank you very much for your positive critique. We have mentioned the number of failures of PLMA or Supreme insertions, which is 0 in the consort diagram, which we also added to our materials and methods section, and also in the results and the discussion.

Materials and Methods: Totally 120 infants (Figure 1) were randomly assigned to either the ProSeal group (Group P; n = 60) or the Supreme group (Group S; n = 60).

Results: In the ProSeal group, the LMA was successfully inserted into 51 patients (85%) after a single attempt versus 47 patients (78.3%) in the Supreme group; in 9 patients (15%) in the ProSeal group and 13 patients (21.7%) in the Supreme group insertion of LMA was successfully in the second attempt. A failed insertion did not occur. The ease of insertion was similar in both groups (Table 3).

Discussion: We believe that the reason why there were no failures in any LMA insertions in our cases was that all cases were conducted in patients of ASA physical status I with normal airways and also by the same experienced anesthesiologist.

Daniele Biasucci (Reviewer 2): I've read with interest this well argued paper on a quite well conceived study which needs some revisions before being published.

1) There is no mention of sample size calculation: please revise the paper accordingly.

2) This is a prospective randomized study and the authors should have followed the CONSORT checklist for such a study: please revise the paper accordingly.

Dear Dr. Daniele Biasucci,

Thank you very much for your critique pointing on some important issues in our manuscript.

1) A power analysis calculating the sample size was added into the methods section.

2) We have revised the CONSORT checklist and changed our title and added a Consort diagram.
We calculated the sample sizes as 40 patients with the assumption of at least of 30% possible difference between any two groups. Therefore, we allocated 60 patients into each group in order to obtain an alpha error of 5% and statistical power of 80%.
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Figure 1. CONSORT Flow Diagram