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Reviewer's report:

Paper by Ott and colleagues explores an interesting topic related to airway management, with reference to "bridge" function of two supraglottic devices allowing intubation: an "historical" one, with very well-known performances and a new one, evolution of Laryngeal Tube. English is fluent, study design coherent and methodologically correct, statistics well designed. Data are well presented, and iconography is exhaustive. In the discussion section I would suggest to underline the concept that any intubation attempt through supraglottic devices should be performed with fiberoptic control, either to improve fiberoptic technique in a protected setting (ventilation always possible, airway conduit allowing better focusing on instrument control) and to minimize the potential of airway trauma and ventilation worsening in rescue scenarios. I would also reference to evolution of supraglottic devices (i.e. Sorbello M. Evolution of supraglottic airway devices: the Darwinian perspective. Minerva Anestesiol. 2018 Mar; 84(3):297-300. doi: 10.23736/S0375-9393.18.12680-0.) and above all with the concept that supraglottic devices are different in materials and principles, thus showing different behaviors and performances, requiring dedicated skills and training and focused on specific situations and patients (i.e. 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.).
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