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**Reviewer's report:**

Paper from Hanamoto and co-workers covers an interesting topic, including not only research issues but also interesting discussion about use of cuffed/uncuffed endotracheal tubes in children.

Tables are missing for appropriate comment and review.

English is fluent and readable; study design is methodologically correct and statistical approach well designed for the purpose.

Some of the limitations declared from Authors are consistent but, in my opinion, they do not affect study results and quality.

My proofs were missing tables, nevertheless I guess they do not include data conditioning my conclusions. I will be happy to review tables also if needed.
Some targeted remarks:

Page 4 line 65. Agree; I would also add a comment on risk/benefit ratio of exposing children to xrays as a further reason to discourage routine radiography

Page 4 line 70: I would expand reasons why Cole's formula could not be used.


As further observations, I was wandering if clinical data are available about sore throat or other minor adverse events in different clusters of chosen OD for the ET. It could add some "clinical" extra-value to study results, addressing for increased care in clinical practice.

As a second point I would be interested in how many cases of tube exchange? How tube exchange was performed? (Tables not included in my proof) Was the patient simply re-intubated or any airway catheter used? I would add these data.
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