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**Reviewer's report:**

Major compulsory Revisions

The authors do not address their hypothesis in the conclusion of their paper, although their methodology is sound the authors did not evaluate a sufficient number of subjects to address their hypothesis. It is also unclear what sample size data the authors sought with their secondary hypothesis.

The methods section states that a SVL Miller blade size 0 was used for intubation. The Miller 0 SVL blade would not have been appropriate in all patients in the age range studied.

Minor essential Revisions

All intubations were performed by a single anesthesiologist, the discussion should include a discussion of potential unintentional biases in performing the laryngoscopies.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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