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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Stefan Schaller

We thank reviewers for fruitful suggestions. We have revised the manuscript on the basis of the reviewers’ comments. The part which we have revised is highlighted in RED.

The original comments of the reviewers and our responses to them are as follows:

Comments of Dr. Thomas Ledowski:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this R1 version of your manuscript! However, though I can see your intentions, I must admit that at this point I struggle to find this matter reflected in your manuscript.

In more detail:

1. Abstract: the abstract is not concisely written and, even for a review, too vague. It would need to be re-drafted to stimulate the interest of readers to read the full article.

We have rewritten the Abstract.

2. The background is not specific to sugammadex: no reversal agent can safely be administered without neuromuscular monitoring.....but this is not at all new. You will need to be much more specific in pointing out why your review is actually new and of interest.
We have modified “Background” section based on your suggestion.

3. You have various chapters dealing with the same idea of ideal sugammadex dosage (risk of recurarization, risk of residual block, obesity) without each chapter telling anything new. Simply referring to the prescribing information by MSD does not satisfy the need for carefully selected references. The topics have already been discussed in previous review articles (i.e. Schaller et al. or Ledowski et al.) about the matter and I simply cannot detect anything that indicates that you have news to report. I guess we have to acknowledge that by now sugammadex is anything but a new drug. In order to publish a review article, one must present new findings or ideas....and I simply cannot see this reflected in your manuscript.

Sadly, what I have stated under 3. is also true for the remainder of the chapters: most of them do not offer anything new. As an example, I may quote the chapter about anaphylaxis: it does not contain new specifics about sugammadex, but mainly mentions the topic of anaphylaxis to anaesthetics and (rather vaguely and without clear guidelines) how to treat and diagnose this.

The lack of novelty may be reflected in the fact that most of your 95 references are from 2015 or long before sugammadex was even introduced into clinical practice. Interestingly, a more recent one by me (Sugammadex: what do we know and what do we still need to know? A review of the recent (2013 to 2014) literature. Anaesth Intensive Care. 2015 Jan;43(1):14-22.) isn't even quoted, despite being freely available. Please do not get me wrong: I am not disappointed because you did not reference my work, but because the 2015 published review deals with many of the same topics and your review does not show me any addition to the knowledge of 2015.

4. In conclusion: I get the idea....but your manuscript just doesn't really deliver the message.

I know that a great deal of sugammadex expertise stems from Japan, and I sincerely hope that you may see my above review not as a personal assault, but merely a professional opinion of a colleague.

Yours

Thomas Ledowski

We truly appreciate your helpful suggestion. We have updated some of our citations. To the best of our knowledge, the review focusing on complications after sugammadex administration have never been summarized. We believe that our review, especially the algorithm of re-establishing neuromuscular blockade, will be an interest to the readers.

Stefan J Schaller, M.D. (Reviewer 4): Dear authors,
Thank you for reviewing your manuscript. I have several major recommendation so that your review becomes more focused on the considerations after sugammadex administration which was your chosen scope of the review. Consequently, quite a substantial part should be omitted since that was focus of prior reviews.

I have made my comments in the attached PDF file and hope you will find them useful to improve your manuscript.

Kind regards,

Stefan

We thank you for your suggestion. We have revised our manuscript based on your suggestion.

We hope you find our manuscript suitable for publication and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Hajime Iwasaki M.D., Ph.D.
Assistant professor
Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine
Asahikawa Medical University, Japan