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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed our revised manuscript entitled ‘Comparison of the Glidescope® and Pentax AWS® laryngoscopes to the Macintosh laryngoscope for use by Advanced Paramedics in easy and simulated difficult intubation’ by Nasim et al. we are delighted that it has been accepted for publication, in principle, in BMC Emergency Medicine.

We would like take this opportunity to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments regarding our manuscript. We have revised the submission in response to these comments, and provide a point-by-point response to these comments in the paragraphs that follow.

Response to Editors Comments

Comment 1: However, before acceptance, we would urge you to further improve the manuscript in response to the comments made by Referee 2. We would be grateful if you could address the comments in a revised manuscript and provide a cover letter giving a point-by-point response to the concerns.

Response: We have revised the manuscript in response to both of the comments made by Dr Hirabayashi. The responses to these comments are itemized below in our response to this reviewer.

Comment 2: Please can you please mention in the Competing Interests Pentax Ltd provided one of the devices? We appreciate that you have clearly mentioned it in the Acknowledgements section, but we feel this information should also be included in the Competing Interests paragraph.

Response: We have included the fact that Pentax supplied the AWS device in the Competing interests section as requested. [Page 15 lines 8 – 9]
Comment 3: Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style (http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals). It is important that your files are correctly formatted.
Response: We have checked that the manuscript conforms to the journal style.

Response to Dr Hirabayashi

Comment 1: Page 11, lines 20-23. The sentence that ‘accidental esophageal intubation… results can result in…’ is strange.
Response: Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention. We have simplified this sentence, such that it now reads as follows: ‘Accidental esophageal intubation can result in catastrophic complications, including pulmonary aspiration of gastric contents, cerebral hypoxia, and cardiac arrest’. [Page 11 lines 20 – 23]

Comment 2: Page 16, Line 6, Figure 2. I propose an error relating the figure legends. The authors describe that the device is held in…, and the tip placed in the vallecula or under the epiglottis. The usage through ‘in the vallecula’ is misleading. Orotracheal intubation using the AWS always requires the tip of the blade to be placed under the epiglottis. Correct placement of the tip under the epiglottis is very important for successful intubation in patients.
Response: Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention. We have amended this sentence as follows: ‘Photograph of the AWS® laryngoscope. The device is held in the left hand and passed into the mouth over the tongue, and the tip is placed under the epiglottis’. [Page 16 lines 6 – 7]

Response to Dr Sakles

Comment 1: I believe the authors have done an excellent job of responding to the reviewers comments. The manuscript is much stronger now and acceptable by me for publication.
Response: Thank you for your kind comments.