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Congratulations to the Authors for their interesting paper in using LMA vs Facemask in the respiratory Management during Catheter Ablation. Airway management both with intravenous anesthesia during RFCA (Radiofrequency Catheter Ablation) is another complex issue, aiming to reach a balance in ventilation and hemodynamic stability.

Also limited in that this is not a randomized study and a single-center study with a limited number of enrolled patients, the conclusions focused on the use of a second generation LMA appear to stabilize ventilation and gas exchange in terms of EtCO2 monitoring in patients undergoing RFCA procedures, improving its efficiency.

The Authors underlined the anatomical explanations of the LMA choice in managing airway, mode of ventilation and gas exchange in terms of CO2 (EtCO2).

The capnography waveforms can clarify various abnormalities in respiratory conditions in subjects' groups. For patients managed with a laryngeal mask, the shape of the capnogram waveform for respiratory cycle resembled a square, while for those using facemasks the shape resembled a triangle. The results of this study suggest that inadequate airway management decreased the maximum and minimum values of CO2 concentration, resulting in inadequate CO2 expulsion. These situations could lead to hyperventilation or decreased respiratory intervals during the RFCA procedure.

Finally, I would like to suggest you to consider the following paper published by very experienced Authors, focusing in LMA uses:

Sorbello M, Petrini F. Supraglottic Airway Devices: the Search for the Best Insertion Technique or the Time to Change Our Point of View?
Turk J Anaesthesiol Reanim. 2017 Apr;45 (2): 76-82

Thank you again to the Authors for their excellent work, and I totally agree regarding the warrenty of randomized multicenter well-powered study population.
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