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Reviewer's report:

It is a well planned and executed study. However, I have a few observations.

In materials and methods section, it has been mentioned that this study is a secondary analysis of data collected from a previously published cohort study. Further, the discussion section states that the results are comparable to a previous study, quoting this same published text (Reference no. 14). The results are bound to be comparable to the original study.

Limitations of the study state that fiberoptic assessment would have taken additional time, causing more anaesthetic exposure to the fetus. Actually fiberoptic examination through the airway tube hardly takes 10 sec, without posing much harm to the fetus.

The conclusion states that "MP score III/IV did not adversely affect the efficacy of supreme LMA in parturients....", but the outcome measure of the study was not efficacy of SLMA but an association of MP score on airway outcomes. So, the conclusion statement may be reframed.

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