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**Reviewer's report:**

This manuscript describes that the use of the Glidescope and Pentax AWS provides less optimization maneuvers, less dental compression, and easier intubation, in comparison with the intubation with Macintosh laryngoscope in manikin.

Minor essential revisions:

1. P8 L11: The author mentions that the severity of dental compression is significantly greater with the Macintosh laryngoscope than the AWS and the Glidescope. According to table 1, the severity of dental compression is also significantly greater with the Glidescope than the AWS. The author should clearly describe this significant difference.

2. P9L23: The meaning of this sentence is unclear. According to table 1 and 3, intubation is all successful with the Macintosh laryngoscope. Therefore, it is impossible to compare the duration of the first “but not the successful” intubation attempt in the scenario 1 and that of the scenario 3.

3. P16L12: There is no symbol denoting the significant difference from same device at the start of the protocol in figure legend of figure 2.

Otherwise, this is well conducted and interesting study.
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