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Reviewer’s report:

A quite good article, as reminding indirect laryngoscopy for airway management even with DLT. But there are some points to comment and to be clarified.

In some part of the manuscript one of the devices has been called as 'Airtraq DL' and in some parts 'Airtraq laryngoscope'. If there is a special blade of Airtraq for DLT, it should be called everywhere in the text as 'Airtraq DL'. Actually there is no such product of Airtraq, when you check the website www.airtraq.com. If there is a such product which is not commercially available, you have to put its photo with a regular Airtraq blade to show the difference. If it is the case then you have to change the key word as Airtraq DL.

You have to indicate the type of DLT used. I mean left sided or right sided. If it is not comparable between groups there should be a lot comments. Maybe to insert left sided is much more easier with one of the device or vice versa.

If you have used the stylet of DLT in order to fit the angle of the blade you have to indicate it. If you have used another stylet you have to define it.

It should be expected that the cardiovascular response to the airway management with Glidescope would be more significant with long duration as the manipulation within upper airway is much more with Glidescope than Airtraq.

Hope these comments and remarks are acceptable for you.
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