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The current article by Ichiro Takenaka et al. highlights usefulness of bougies for intubation with the Airway Scope (AWS). Some anesthesiologists use the gum elastic busies with AWS for difficult intubations. And there are a lot of busies. Thus this study is very practical and interesting.

Here are my comments that may help improve this article.

Major Compulsory Comments:

A. Overall comments

The experiment design is very simple and easy to understand. The author recommends two bousies for aids of intubation with AWS due to easier manipulation. Easier manipulation may mean bousies are harder, which may induce airway damage1).

B. Major comments

1. Results and discussion
Form Above reason, the additional discussion about airway damage will be needed.
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