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Reviewer's report:

The authors investigated whether semiprone position can be superior to supine position for paediatric endotracheal intubation during massive regurgitation. Regurgitation was simulated by the way described in the article. Consequently, semiprone position was superior to supine position in their simulated situation.

Comments

It is important to perform ETI in semiprone position and this method is probably useful for the patients with regurgitation. However, it is difficult to prove that semiprone position is superior to supine position during massive regurgitation in real situations. Regarding their simulated regurgitation, it could have been an excessively unfavorable situation for the supine position. Thus, their model might not have represented the real situation. Please make a comment about the validity of their simulated regurgitation. In addition, this study was not blinded. Therefore, each evaluation might have been strongly biased by participants. It is probable that participants thought that semiprone position provided better conditions than expected, which might have affected subjective assessment. Please make a comment about this concern.

Although I said above, this study is interesting and attractive. It is reasonable to think that ETI in semiprone position is one of required skills for CPR provides.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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