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Reviewer's report:

The authors tried to introduce the usability of novel technique for repositioning a nasobiliary catheter from the mouth to nostril. Though this novel technique is very interesting, this study has some problem. The authors should clarify the following points.

1. Though I understand this study is retrospective fashion, it is necessary to explain how the patient was allocated (depend on time? operator? facility?)?

2. Page 8, line 10: "Patients without sufficient~", how many patients were excluded? The authors should clarify the number of patients who were excluded in this study in each group.

3. Page 9, line 42; "mean ± SDs", Were all continuous variables normally distributed? If not, continuous variables should be presented "median (range)". If continuous variables were normally distributed, t-test should be used.

4. Page 10, line 35; I cannot understand the reason why difficult to use the new technique in two patients, anatomical reason? Please make it clear. How about Mallampati score of this two patients? How to tube reposition in this two patients?

5. Page 11, line 53; "Appropriate depth", how to decide the "appropriate depth"?

6. Page 13, line 21; Was this study approved by Ethics Committiee of each institutes?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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