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Reviewer's report:

Tan and colleagues report association of Mallampati scoring on airway outcomes in women undergoing general anaesthesia with SupremeTM laryngeal mask airway in caesarean section. They found that high MP was not associated with reduced efficacy of SLMA in obstetric caesarean section under general anaesthesia but might increase the risk of blood found on SLMA upon removal. This is a topic that is of great importance to anesthetists and the prospective study is well designed. However, a few of issues should be addressed.

1. There was a huge gap in the number of patients in two groups which might lead to bias.

2. This study was a prospective cohort study which required a large sample size. So how did the author calculate the sample size in this study?

3. It was clearly showed in the Table 2 that there was a difference in the baseline of BMI between the two groups. The propensity score analysis should be used to match the baseline.

4. The logistic analysis should be used to analysis the association of Mallampati scoring on airway outcomes.

5. The measurement of the size of tongue base should have a further discussion which has been mentioned in the article.

6. The possible reason why high MP would increase the risk of blood found on SLMA upon removal should be discussed.

7. The manuscript contains several grammatically mistake. The author should check the manuscript more carefully.

8. The manuscript needs edition suitable for publication. For example, "Caesarean" should be "caesarean" in line 2. "[4,8],." should be "[4,8]." In line 36.
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