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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

I would like to thank the authors for their work. The purpose of this article is clearly stated and the interpretation of the results are clearly presented. The discussion follows an appropriate pattern. However, I have minor comments regarding the manuscript, which are itemized below.

1. It would be appropriate for the authors to point out that the study was conducted based on a sample of a Korean population

2. It would be pertinent to include information regarding the specialty of the surgeries to which the patients were subjected.

3. Page 5, line 102.: delete "And"

4. The study has not protocolized the technique of anaesthetic induction, so it is possible that direct laryngoscopy and endotracheal intubation has not been performed under the same conditions in all patients. This methodological limitation could have generated biases in the results. The authors should specify this point in the limitations section.

5. The authors can highlight the limitations of the study
6. Page 8, line 165: The authors assert "one patient was intubated successfully after multiple laryngoscopic trials": The authors should specify why they did not use an alternative rescue technique instead of using direct laryngoscopy in repeated attempts.

7. I have not had access to table 4 that the authors indicate in the results section

8. The results section should be limited exclusively to presenting the results of the study. Delete the sentence "and as shown in other previous trials(11-82.4%)".

9. Combination of tests and scoring systems are more adequate in predicting difficult airways than one individual traditional test. The paper only included the predictive ability of individual tests. It would be interesting to analyze which set of tests predict with greater precision the difficult laryngoscopy in the selected sample.

10. It could be interesting to contribute figures with the ROC curves

11. The discussion should initially provide an overview of study and then compare the findings in relation to previous studies.

12. Many statements included in the discussion should include bibliographic references. example: page 10 line 215 and 217

Thank you and good luck.
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