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Reviewer's report:

"STATISTICAL REVIEWER ASSESSMENT:

Is the study design appropriate for the research question (considering whether the analyzed population accurately reflects the design and whether you see any problems with control/comparison groups, e.g., likely confounders)?

Yes - overall design, population, and control groups are appropriate

Are methodologies adequate and well implemented (considering whether assumptions are addressed and whether analyses are robust)?

Yes - methodologies are adequate and well implemented, assumptions are addressed, analysis is robust

Are the analyses adequately communicated (considering whether reporting details are adequate and whether figures and tables are well labeled and described)?

No - there are minor issues

Does the interpretation accurately reflect the analyses without overstatement (considering whether limitations/bias are acknowledged and whether accurate descriptors, e.g., 'significant', are used)?

Yes - interpretation accurately reflects analyses, limitations/bias are acknowledged, accurate descriptors are used
Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a statistically sound contribution?

Probably - with minor revisions

STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:

The authors conducted an equivalence study to compare Supreme laryngeal mask airway and endotracheal intubation. The study is well powered (460 patients per group). The flow chart is helpful. All tables were easy to understand.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The authors did a good job overall. It might be a good idea to state their hypothesis at the end of introduction (page 7). What is their hypothesis when they design this study? For the results section, they compare SLMA with ETT (ETT as the reference). This is true for Table 2. However, they switched to the compare of ETT with SLMA (SLMA as the reference). You can clearly tell by the risk ratio of presence of blood on airway devices. It might be a good idea to be consistent. They need to double check on the accuracy of the risk ratio. Take the presence of blood on airway devices (Table 3) as an example, the risk ratio should be 1.28 (if I compare ETT with SLMA). I have a hard time understanding where the RR=1.31 comes from. Please make sure that you use ETT as the reference in Table 3."
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:

Acceptable
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