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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors,

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.

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.

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
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