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Editors
BMC Anesthesiology
Rebuttal/Revision

Dear Editors:

Reviewer one had no further tasks for us.

Reviewer two asked for corrections in 11 sentences. The eleven sentences have been corrected and are highlighted in yellow in the text:

1. Page 5, rewrite the last sentence. Done as directed.
2. Page 6, rewrite first sentence of challenge one. Done as directed.
3. Page 6, sentence starting with, “further suggestions...” Done as directed.
4. Page 7, last line: add “h” to however. Done as directed.
5. Page 9, delete last sentence in second paragraph beginning with, “Also, the fact..” Done as directed.
7. Page 13, challenge seven, word intubated inserted as directed.
8. Page 15, sentence 5, rewritten as directed.
9. Page 15, last sentence, rewritten as directed.
10. Page 15 summary, last sentence, same paragraph rewritten as directed.
11. Page 16, paragraph rewritten using old version as directed.

Respectfully,

Thomas J. Papadimos for the authors.