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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

The authors carried out an important study concerning the role of supraglottic airway devices in the hands of inexperienced users. Relevant literature available (PubMed: "laryngeal mask inexperienced"), including comparisons of the two devices studied and on training requirements should be discussed:


There is additional literature available on this topic when search is not limited to "laryngeal mask".
References on other devices that are already part of ERC 2005 guidelines are redundant (Agro 2002); citation of the original guidelines (Nolan 2005) is sufficient, a German summary (Wenzel 2006) provides no additional information.

It remains unclear why the authors chose a tidal volume of < 150 ml (= death space) as the threshold to define sufficient ventilation, when ERC guidelines consider 400 ml with supplemental oxygen and even higher volumes without oxygen as sufficient.

No information is provided on gastric leakage, which is a standard concern when testing supraglottic airway devices.

Minor essential revisions

Diligent proof-reading is recommended to eliminate avoidable mistakes (e.g. Reference 8: "Training nursing stuff" >> "Training nursing staff"

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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