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Reviewer's report:

I will attempt to restate my previous question to make it more clear as it was not addressed by the authors. As I understand it the primary goal of this paper was to compare the SVL to the AOL in children less than two years old, their secondary aim was to generate data for sample size calculations for larger trials in similar settings.

1. What data were they trying to generate that is not available in previous studies. Please state this in the manuscript.
2. The authors methodology is sound and unique.
3. Why couldn’t pilot data be obtained by simply performing intubations with each device separately and documenting the desired outcomes rather than performing a comparative trial with such small numbers?

Please state somewhere in the manuscript that unintentional biases of the intubator could have influenced the results.
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