Reviewer's report

Title: Comparison of the Glidescope, CMAC, Storz DCI with the Macintosh Laryngoscope: A Manikin Study

Version: 2 Date: 29 May 2012

Reviewer: david turnbull

Reviewer's report:

I acknowledge the changes that were made and I am grateful that the authors felt my criticism helped improve the final manuscript. I have made a few minor points, but I am satisfied with the content and context of the revised manuscript.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes the question posed is defined by the title of the study.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Within the constraints of a manikin study the methods are appropriate and defined.

3. Are the data sound? The data is sound, but I would like the editor to consider if an average/mean value is appropriate for the Cormack and Lehane grade as this is an ordinal scale. A Cormack and Lehane grade of 1.4 does not exist, but my statistics is inadequate to answer this question, though a search suggests this not an uncommon representation of ordinal data.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Difficult laryngoscopy is defined as a Cormack and Lehane grade III or IV at intubation. This is generally carried out with a Macintosh Blade. The system was developed for the Macintosh blade and comparison with videolaryngoscopy may not be appropriate. Therefore, perhaps the authors may want to consider how best to measure the performance of videolaryngoscopes in the future and if a C and L score is appropriate.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? The discussion considers the limitations of a Manikin. The reader should also be able to distinguish between a difficult laryngoscopy that this study considers and a difficult airway that this study does not. Though a difficult airway may be considered to be one where the Macintosh fails and clearly the Macintosh is very effective in this study. How to reproduce the difficult airway in a Manikin is clearly difficult.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? There is a large volume of published work in the literature and the references convey an appropriate balance.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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