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Reviewer's report:

General comments:

This is a well written manuscript of a prospective observational trial handling a common problem especially in ENT anesthesia. The authors have tested the hypothesis that orally placed AECs dislocate more frequently than nasal AECs. The initial power calculation and the applied statistics were well planned and correct. Interestingly, the rate of dislocation between groups is not significantly different. In addition, the authors were able to prove that capnography cannot reliably detect a correct or incorrect AEC position. Unfortunately, the trial was underpowered due to the low difference between the dislocation rates of 7.2% vs. 2.6%. However, the authors discussed this fact well in the limitations section. The discussion is appropriate, and the conclusions seems to be adequate.

In summary, the present manuscript is the result of a well planned prospective trial and deals with an important problem of anaesthetists everyday life. The statistics are correct and the conclusions and limitations are reasonable. The results are discussed sufficiently.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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