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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
Abstract: The second part of the hypothesis refers to differences between complication rates. However, Neither in the results nor in the conclusions complication rates are mentioned.

p5, l20: Video laryngoscopic intubation time differs with regard to the blade type. Therefore, the authors should compare the effects of indirect curved vs. indirect macintosh blades.

p13, l2: The low incidence of emergent and difficult airway cases suggest a primary use of the GlideScope in these cases.

p14, l2: Mucosal injuries are a well known problem of curved indirect blades.

p14, l5: Why are there any esophageal intubations in the video laryngoscopy group (intubation under vision)?

p15, l4: The varying level of expertise within laryngoscopists is interesting; however, it limits the conclusions of this study.

p15, l13: But the second part of the hypothesis was that there would be no difference in complication rates.

p15, l21: Since in the C-MAC device it is possible to interchange the blade types (Macintosh, D-Blade, Miller), it is important to mention, which blade type has been used in the reported findings.

p16, l20: This is the major shortcoming of this investigation: It again compares one video laryngoscope with direct laryngoscopy. What we need are studies that compare different video laryngoscopy devices.

p17, l6: What was the escape strategy if GlideScope intubations failed? This has to be mentioned.

p27: Why are mucosal injuries statistically different (15 vs. 12), while the numbers of esophageal intubations are not (24 vs. 2)?

With regards to the initial hypothesis, the authors seem to lurch between confirmation and rejection of their hypothesis.
Minor Essential Revisions

Literature 11 should be in the same style.
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