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Reviewer's report:

Next time please highlight the modifications in the revised manuscript.

P2L1-6 - The first sentence of the Abstract section is misleading. It suggests that no optimal strategy exist / is advocated to prevent RNMB.

P4L13 - "of" is missing after 15% 

P7L11 - "the physician performing the TOFR" - this is incorrect. Probably the authors meant "performing TOF monitoring".

In the reviewer's opinion Table 3 carries the most important information of the study. The authors should consider including the data of the non-reversed patients in the table also. It is of note that NMM could significantly decrease the occurrence of RNMB in the non-reversed patients also.

P10L3 - The authors could consider including the overall RNMB rate here.

The first and second paragraphs of the Results section belong together, could be joined.

The one patient who "exhibited" RNMB in the monitored group is already mentioned in line 3. There's no need to repeat in the second paragraph.
P11L52 - Please add the comparator to the end of the sentence (…than in the non-monitored group…) 

P13L1-6 - The sentence is a bit confusing. Please consider: The incidence of RNMB in patients who received neostigmine in the nonmonitored group was 40% and 0% in the monitored group.

P13L6 - The authors mention 1 recent study, while two references are included.

P13L55 - Please consider using "antagonists / reversal agents" instead of antagonism.

P14L8 - temperature may have affected the TOF measurements

P14L28 - "exhibited" is probably not the best verb here, as explained by the next sentence.

P14L35-43 How did normalization influence this specific case? Not sure if this belongs here. The TOFR<0.9 in this case could rather arise from the use different monitors, different hand and thumb position, and the variability of TOFR measurements, conscious patient…

P14L55 - "Any current" - this is hard to interpret. What if the pulse width is 0.3 msec not 0.2 msec?
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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal