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Reviewer’s report:

The authors conducted the prospective, randomized study to compare the clinical performance of the LMA-Protector and the i-gel in regard to airway sealing pressure, insertion time, ease and accuracy of insertion, and the incidence of postoperative sore throat. The study protocol was prospectively registered and generally well written.

I need authors to do a few corrections for the well-structured paper.

Consider the following:

Introduction

- Clarify the primary hypothesis

- The reason why authors compare the LMA protector and i-gel, among the numerous supraglottic airway devices.

Methods

The description of blinding should be clearer, regarding to primary and secondary outcome, although authors mentioned it as limitations.

- P4 line 13

Did authors use neuromuscular monitoring?

- P4 line 17 and 25

How do you differentiate between 'head extension and flexion position' and additional maneuver?

- P5 line 3

Describe order and number of Required 3 maneuvers.
- P5 line 16

Clarify the confirmation of full recovery of the spontaneous ventilation. Describe the antagonism of neuromuscular block.

- P5 line 24

Describe the pilot study. Enrolled number, mean SD in leak pressure.

Discussion

- P8 line 6~

Whilst the primary outcome, oropharyngeal leak pressure shows a statistically significant difference, the question of clinical significance is questionable. Any firm clinical benefit?

- P8 line 12


- P8 line 18-20

Is there any other factor influence on insertion time except cuff inflation?

- P8 line 28

It would be helpful if the reference is added.

- P10 line 4

Clarify whether the two physicians had similar distribution of the use of the two devices in the method section

- P10 line 9

Add obesity considering BMI

Table 3

- Severity of sore throat

You mean not VAS? I wonder if there is small number of results despite authors used 100 mm scale. Pain is not severe?
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.

Yes

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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