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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors, you write that an ethical approval was not needed. Is this what your ethical board stated or is it your own opinion. Here in Sweden you need always an ethical approval when you want to publish a study concerning patients. Could you write in the text who stated this, thank you. You write that they (the patients) asked for consent, you mean of course they were asked to give consent, correct this. It seems that the results, even if they improved, still are quite insufficient. These patients were ASA 1 and 2, can they really do the intubation in the ER with much more difficult patients after this training, should be discussed in detail. I think now the article gives a too positive picture of what you can achieve in one month. What is the standard level we can agree upon being sufficient enough? Is it really 83%?? How do you explain this to the 17% where you don't succeed. You have the right thoughts in the conclusion but you have to write about what the real level of competence should be. You discuss the amount of intubations, but your results gives numbers and this discussion is missing. I am sure there are anesthesiologists that have written about this subject. This is a very good start, but is it enough, and how have you planned to keep the skills good enough in the future with so few intubations in the ER per doctor?

The references have the page numbers in many different formats, stick to one format please.
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