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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Editor of BMC Anesthesiology,

in this study, the authors perform an observational study comparing two different induction regimen (propofol vs ketofol) regarding to ease of laryngeal mask insertion and hemodynamic impact.

This topic is not very original, because the hemodynamic effect of ketofol mixture is quite well described in the literature. Furthermore also the laryngeal mask insertion during ketofol was already studied in randomized trials.

I have some major concern about the proposed observational methodology. In the sampling section is not well stated who decide to use propofol or ketofol and why.

Generally, data in observational studies are collected only by monitoring what occurs, while experiments require the primary variable be assigned for each subject by the researchers. Making causal conclusions based on experiments is often reasonable. However, making the same causal conclusions based on observational data is not generally recommended. Thus, observational studies are generally only sufficient to show associations.

Please clarify the study design and the sampling section.

Minor concern:

Line 148-149: BSc an MSc is used without prior definition

Table 2: I suggest to specify the statistical test employed and to report the p value in the table

Table 3,5,6: please specify the unit of measure of variables (apnea, MAP…)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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