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Dear Editorial Board Members:

Re:
Manuscript Title: GlideScope Use Improves Intubation Success Rates: An Observational Study using Propensity Score Matching.
Corresponding Author: Michael P. Mangione
e-mail: mangionemp@anes.upmc.edu

Please accept the enclosed manuscript, now with page and line numbers added, for consideration for publication in BMC Anesthesiology.

We believe that this article will be of interest to the scientific community because it demonstrates, in a large-scale, real-world application, that the GlideScope is associated with greater first pass intubation success than direct laryngoscopy even though the GlideScope was used with more frequency in patients with predictors of difficult intubation. Because this was a prospective, observational study, we have used a propensity score matching algorithm in an attempt to accurately characterize the difference between the techniques.

This full manuscript has not been published previously, either in whole or in part, and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. A portion of the material within was previously presented at the American Society of Anesthesiologists Annual Meeting. Oct, 2011. Chicago, IL, and was the subject of an article in Anesthesiology News.

All authors attest to the originality of the text, and the originality of any/all supporting tables, images, and supplementary electronic materials as related to this document. We also hereby affirm that ethical approval for this work was obtained as appropriate to this work and that all authors have made material contributions to this manuscript according to the rules of authorship. As detailed with the manuscript, all authors deny any competing interests. All authors deny issue with the editorial policies detailed in the instructions for authors.

Finally, all authors accept that the corresponding author will be the sole author of further communication with the editorial office related to this manuscript, including any and all revisions, and he will have the authority to communicate on behalf of all authors in regards to further correspondence with the Editor and other necessary parties.

Yours sincerely,

Michael P. Mangione