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Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Dear Authors,

thank you for your kindly punctuations to my questions.

Your answer about Page 6, line, line 19: you cite "neuromuscular blocking agent". Please explain the choice of NMBA and discuss it. I think that it is the correct choice to insert SAD and I am agree, but you should discuss this argument, is:

"A2. We think there is misunderstanding about neuromuscular blocking agent. "All patients underwent a standard general anesthesia technique without the use of neuromuscular blocking agent after 3 min of preoxygenation with a face mask."

Many previous studies which we cited in the present study were not prefer the neuromuscular agent. Therefore, we did not use neuromuscular agent."

It's correct but it would have been desirable for you to explain: "why you didn't use the NMBAs?" about the use of neuromuscular blocking agents or not its use.

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.

No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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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