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Reviewer’s report:

This study aims to demonstrate previous stated hypothesis that FLMA supraglottic device reduces incidence and severity postoperative sore throat and other laryngospasm related symptoms. It adds further data and information regarding this hypothesis, given that it is only the second RC single blind trial on this matter, as previous studies are available, but not many comparing uses to ETT in this specific procedure. It is novel, given that it addresses an area which lacks sufficient reproducible studies, but it also raises questions whether or nor this approach is safe enough to carry on a regular basis and especially small centers and wether or not its reproducibility is feasible in other centers.Regarding the article's structure, it is well structured, abstract is nicely done, length is appropriated, and it summarizes adequately the main and secondary outcomes and key findings. Background is clearly organized in logic order, easy to follow through and citations are appropriate and adequate even though only 5 are less 5years since published, which could be due to the newness of this FLMA a but also shows that supporting studies are needed and evidence is limited, and adds to the newness of the topic which makes it interesting. Logic and interpretation of results is appropriate, better tables and graphics are needed, as the ones shown add little information and conclusions are short and concise.
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