Author’s response to reviews

Title: The intuitive use of laryngeal airway tools by first year medical students

Authors:

Johannes Bickenbach (jbickenbach@ukaachen.de)
Gereon Schaelte (gschaelte@ukaachen.de)
Stefan Beckers (sbeckers@ukaachen.de)
Michael Fries (mfries@ukaachen.de)
Matthias Derwall (mderwall@ukaachen.de)
Rolf Rossaint (rrossaint@ukaachen.de)

Version: 4 Date: 10 August 2009

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Mrs. Pafitis

Thank you very much for the positive answer within your letter of July 14, 2009. The reviewers’ comments were again integrated into the manuscript.

Reviewer 1:

Tidal volume <150ml, n (%) >>> the percentage is missing for both values for first and second evaluation, only numbers are stated.

>>According percentage details are now added

Reviewer 2:

The authors tried hard to answer all reviewer’s question, therefore, the article now may be published in BMC Emergency Medicine. Only few points should be addressed, but need no further review.

1. There are more enrolled volunteers in the surprisingly additionally incorporated re-evaluation of the volunteers after 6 months in the revised version, than primarily enrolled (61 vs. 60). It may be interesting how authors try to explain this mistake that happened when incorporating an addition to the study protocol including all results as an answer to the reviewer’s question. In every case, this mistake has to be corrected.

>>We apologize for this inconvenience. SPSS data was re-checked and all values are correct. Within the table made a simple transcription or rather typing error occurred. The mistake is now corrected.

2. The manuscript needs a wording and language work-up by a native speaker.

>>Diligent proof reading was done by the authors and by a native speaker. Changes made are again highlighted red.

We are delighted to re-send a revised version. We would not mind a press
release. If there remain any queries do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Sincerely,

Johannes Bickenbach