Dear reviewers:

Thanks very much for taking your time to review our manuscript entitled "Comparison of the clinical performance of i-gel and Ambu Laryngeal masks in anaesthetised paediatric patients: a meta-analysis" (ID: 71874). Those comments are valuable and very helpful. We have read through comments carefully and have made corrections. The responses to the your comments are as follows:

Reviewer #1: 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.

We are grateful for the suggestion. As suggested by the reviewer, we have added more descriptions in Table 1 and added a more detailed interpretation regarding it to the part of "Insertion time" in synthesis of results and discussion .

Reviewer #2: 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.

Thank you for underlining this deficiency. According with your advice, we amended the relevant part in manuscript(page 18) and the search string in each database are available in Supplementary material.
- the "inception date" must be specified.

Thank you for the suggestion. In the part of "Literature search", we have specified the inception date in line 1, page 4.

 -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.

Thank you for the suggestion. In the second column of Table 1, there are the experimental group and control group of each RCTs.
- Captions of figure 3, 4 and 5 should be more detailed.

We agree with the comment and re-wrote the captions of figure 3, 4 and 5 in the revised manuscript .
- 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.

Thanks for your considerations. In the first paragraph of the discussion, we emphasized the main results of this meta-analysis, and to be more clearly and in accordance with the your concerns, we have added a more detailed interpretation on the primary and secondary outcomes.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding our submission. We would be glad to respond to any further questions and comments that you may have.

Best regards,
Xu Jin
October 26, 2021