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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

The concept of the study is good. But there are flaws in the writing of the manuscript along with a few flaws in the study design. Please refer to my comments below for a detailed explanation.

Methods:

There is no mention of inclusion criteria in the methods section.

Page 4, Line 119: there is repetition of text.

Page 4, line 129: The authors have said that the patients were pre-medicated with per oral midazolam. Patients were to be intubated using LMA so the amount of water allowed to them for taking the premedication becomes vital.

Line 160: How was the initial endotracheal tube (the make and the size) selected? Was this randomised?

Please mention clearly the starting and end points of time T2a, T2b and T2c.

Results:

Line 220: Please mention the units of measurements of airway leak pressures.

Initially as per your method section it appears that the patients have been randomised into two groups. Later as we read the results, we find that there are two sub-groups of each of the primary groups. This was not mentioned anywhere in your methodology section.

As per your methods, there is no mention of measurement of clinical predictors of difficult airway. They suddenly appear out of nowhere in the results.

Again, there is no mention of the severity grades of sore throat or hoarseness in the methods, whereas the table depicting the same is there in the results section.
Line 337: Which optimisation manoeuvres were performed? There is no mention of the same in
the methods and results section.

Line 378: How was gastric insufflation measured?

Conclusion:

Statements are not in-keeping with the objectives of the study.

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.

Unable to assess

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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