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Reviewer's report:

page 9 line 190: Please describe the checklist of tasks.
page 10, line 221: Why 2 and not 3 groups, one for each CA year, 1,2,3?
page 11, line 240: Residents in what years?
page 11, lines 245-246: was the simulation mannequin that of a normal or difficult airway? what brand type of airway mannequin? Laerdal?
page 12, line 12: Why did the residents not consult staff more often? 32% seems low. At my institution, the staff during the day and staff on call always attend all out intubations, in and outside the OR.
page 13, lines 278-282: What was the total number of intubations achieved by each group of residents?
page 13, table: why were the junior residents not split into CA1 and CA 2 years?
page 14, table: In first glidescope attempt section, do the residents know how to evaluate for a difficult airway?
page 15, line 312: Please add the words, "in our institution." At other institutions, the results may be different. Not all training programs are the same.
page 17 line 351: I think that discussion of medical legal issues should be discussed if staff are not present. Staff are present at my institution for this reason.
page 17, line 371-372: What was the associated time limit?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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