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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions
line 142-143: in any case comparison between videolaryngoscopes should have been performed better on same DLT size. Data for distribution of sizes in two groups would be recommended (larger tube could be more difficult to insert). They could be integrated in table 2.

Minor Revisions
line 76-77: for precision, only Glidescope has integrated video camera, while this option is available only with external accessory on airtraq
line 82: the literatures have -> Literature has,
line 119: better to add reference for guidelines or criteria adopted for definition of difficult airways (see below ref 16)
line 120-121: more than contraindication for videolaryngoscopes it is more indication for flexible awake fiberoptic. Anyway less than 3 cm mouth opening is someway already part of definition of difficult airways, thus resulting per se exclusion criteria. I would clarify this sentence.
lines 137: useful to specify which condition was expected on NMT monitoring in both groups.
line 139: CL grading was designed for Macintosh blade, on “line of sight” principle. Comparison with videolaryngoscopes using CL could be unfair and always strongly preferring videolaryngoscopes. It would have been interesting to add other measurement for videolaryngoscopes, such as Freemantle score or POGO so to compare more “balanced way” videolaryngoscopes performance. Could add some comments here or in section for discussion (lines 282).
line 216: comment could be added, either here or in discussion, for typical situation with videolaryngoscopes in which a better view (if compared with Macintosh) does not correspond directly with better intubation.
Line 138: reference 20 typing mistake, “lumenendobronchial"

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being
published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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