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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

congratulations to a nice study.

I would like to address a few points:

Simplicity of understanding:

- Maybe one or 2 pictures of the AWS with the inserted tube and bougie would make it easier and faster to understand since not every reader might be familiar with the Pentax AWS.

Clarification of meaning:

- Some sentences would need some clarification of meaning, maybe the double translation Japanese-English-German may have an influence here, so an English native speaker with anesthesiologist background may give even better suggestions:

  o "In addition, when the epiglottis cannot be directly lifted with the tip of the AWS blade, 180 degree rotation of the bougie tip often requires for successful intubation."

  → to me, "is often required" sounds more familiar.

  o "However, at least, the bougies of which rotation was difficult in this bench study should not be easily rotated in humans."

  → I guess, what you want to say, is, that your study indicates, that also in "real life" we could experience difficulties when trying to rotate Frova and Portex bougies in an AWS?

Clinical relevance:

- Please add a manikin study with one or two commercial available difficult airway manikins and a group of anesthesiologists who are randomized to perform intubations with all 4
bougies in different order and evaluate for: intubation time, intubation success and specific problems encountered with each bougie. E.g. it could be, that the 2

Randomization:

- Please add a chart in which the reader can see in which order each bougie was used by the 7 anesthesiologists.

Kind regards
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