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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to review this interesting manuscript. The authors compared the intubating conditions of the GlideScope and the Pentax-AWS to that using the conventional Macintosh laryngoscopy when used by Advanced Paramedic, which comparison was tested on manikins. The authors concluded that the GlideScope and the Pentax-AWS possess advantage over the Macintosh laryngoscope when used by the Emergency Medicine Technicians in a manikin study.

General comments

The authors’ institution has published a lot of articles regarding indirect laryngoscopes. With respect to the BMC Emergency Medicine, we can see a manikin study, in which the Airtraq and Truview laryngoscopes were compared to the Macintosh laryngoscope (BMC Emergency Medicine 2009,9:2). The current report seems to be one of this series. The study is well designed and performed. The conclusion is drawn from the results of the investigation. My significant concern, however, is the discussion section. The second paragraph (Page 11, line13 - Page 12, line 9) is identical to the first and second paragraph of the previously published discussion by the same author (BMC Emergency Medicine 2009,9:2, page 5 of 9). This copy and paste will disappoint the readers of the BMC Emergency Medicine. The other approach for discussion is likely to attract the interest of many readers. [Major Compulsory Revisions]

Specific comments

Page 8, line 11, Figure 2; line 16, Figure 3.
The indicated figures are not coincident with the text sentences. There are a lot of typographical errors in figure numbers (Page 9, lines 11, 23, and page10, lines 1, 8). [Minor Essential Revisions]

Page 14, the last line – Page 15, line 1. The authors declare that AM, JO’D, and BDH participated in the study, recruited patients... However, the reported study is a manikin study, but not a study with patients. [Minor Essential Revisions]

Page 16, Figure legends, Figure 1.
Panel A (Figure 1). The legend has a strange sentence. Since the GlideScope
does not have any side channel, it cannot be equipped with a tracheal tube. Indeed, I cannot find the tracheal tube in Figure 1.

Panel B (Figure 2). This is strange, too. The legend confuses the readers. The Pentax-AWS has a built-in LCD monitor, but not eyepiece. [Major Compulsory Revisions]

Page 16, Legend for Figure 2.
The legend for a box plot graph should be for Figure 3. [Minor Essential Revisions]

Page 16, Legend for Figure 3.
This legend for a graph should be for Figure 4. [Minor Essential Revisions]

Page 18, Reference 16.
Cite reference is incomplete. Please provide volume and page numbers. [Minor Essential Revisions]

Pages 21-24. Tables (1, 2, 3 and 4) fail to display the P values for the initial 3-group analysis. Please provide P values of initial 3-group analysis and then, post poc analysis for between-group comparison. In addition, please remove all vertical lines from the tables. [Major Compulsory Revisions]
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