Reviewer’s report

Title: LMA® GASTRO™ Airway for endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography: a retrospective observational analysis

Version: 0 Date: 03 Dec 2019

Reviewer: Timothy Ness

Reviewer's report:

This manuscript by Tran et al is a retrospective case series related to use of the LMA Gastro Airway in patients undergoing ERCP. It represents a larger series that what has been published previously but unfortunately adds little information related to the benefits of this device.

The authors list as a significant limitation the lack of a comparison group even though they had data from 85 ERCP procedures which were performed with sedation and 28 ERCP procedures which were performed using general endotracheal anesthesia. Inclusion of data from these other groups, even with the caveat that they represented "selected" populations due to anesthesiologist preference, would have allowed appropriate statements related to comparability to be performed. It would be surprising if there were not greater episodes of hypoxia in the sedation group that in this study group. That would have been meaningful to the reader and this novel comparison would have allowed for an extension of knowledge related to anesthesiology practice.

Heart rate and use of pressors were presented as the only bits of hemodynamic data (although the latter was not otherwise quantified or defined). It would have been meaningful to also know information about blood pressure alterations with the different methods.

The acronym GLT should be defined in the text (not just the abbreviations list) when used and some description of that device given since it is the primary comparative treatment present in the literature.

Also, needs a formal statement of no support from LMA GASTRO or associated businesses for any of the authors.
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