PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71874

Title: Comparison of the Clinical Performance of i-gel and Ambu Laryngeal Masks in Anaesthetised Paediatric Patients: A Meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03307766

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Director, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Kazakhstan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-26 13:21

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-30 09:10

Review time: 3 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this paper. Here are my main comments: - the parameters of the systematic literature search must be defined in detail. A specific table should be added to describe in detail the search string in each database. - the "inception date" must be specified. -the graphical aspect of Table 1 should be improved - Since these are RCTs, the comparison group(s) should be included and specific in Table 1. - Captions of figure 3, 4 and 5 should be more detailed. - In the discussion, I think the authors should highlight and emphasize the main and/or most relevant findings and discuss them systematically one by one. In the current version, the discussion sounds a little dispersive and may be also expanded.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71874

Title: Comparison of the Clinical Performance of i-gel and Ambu Laryngeal Masks in Anaesthetised Paediatric Patients: A Meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05235988

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Reviewer_Country

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-26 23:57

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-03 00:38

Review time: 6 Days

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Dr.Xu Jin,   Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. Manuscript entitled "Comparison of the clinical performance of i-gel and Ambu Laryngeal masks in anaesthetised paediatric patients: a meta-analysis" has been reviewed.   In this multicenter study, the authors investigated the efficacy and safety of two types supraglottic airway devices (SGAs) in anesthetised pediatric patients. Although the readers of this journal will certainly be interested in the findings of this study, I have annotated the manuscript with several minor corrections, which I believe will improve the readability.   I agree that the level of experience of the practitioner who inserted the SGAs and depth of anesthesia may become an influence bias of this study, as you have stated in the Discussion section. Therefore, if possible, it would be useful for the readers to see the differences between these factors in all seven studies you have included in Table 1. Moreover, it would be preferable to include more details in the Discussion a based on these results.