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Confidential Comments to the author / please do not publish it:

Thank you very much for your corrections and improvements.

However, unfortunately your descriptions of your experiments again do not match your figures. I would like to emphasize that it is important to give people enough time and support to deliver accurate results and to meticulously check the delivered data, results, photographs, artwork before publishing it. Unfortunately we have a big problem with incorrect or insufficient publications which are done in a hurry. I really think that your publication will add information to the scientific community having myself experience with different bougies. And I appreciate the effort and the improvements coming at every revision. However I think you can do better and I hope for your further publications, you will be more accurate in the first time.

Please exchange: P4 line 31-34:

„The tip of the AWS blade was set 15mm from a vertical circular protractor."

If this is the case, Figure 1a is incorrect

➔ the tip of the AWS blade is here 15+5 = 20mm apart from the vertical circular protractor.

Otherwise: "The tip of the AWS blade was set 20mm from a vertical circular protractor."

A table is not a floor, vertically fits better to standing than lying.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown? 
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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