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Reviewer's report:

1. Methods/Discussion: please specify who intubated the patients using the AWS and the ML. Was it the same group of individuals, or were there many anesthesiologists involved? Were those who used the AWS and ML experienced/expert in those techniques? This would be useful to help interpret the complications that occurred with use of the ML. Could the difference have simply been due to user error?

2. Please comment on the difference in CL between the AWS and ML groups in the results section (currently not in that section). In table 3, I found it confusing that CL grade was resulted as 1(1;1) for both AWS and ML and yet there was a significant difference. I assume this was a mistake? Same for the quality of visual recognition -- both are listed as 0 in table 3, so how is there a difference?

3. Clarification for table 3: I assume CL = cleft lip, CLAP = cleft lip and palate. What is CLA?

4. An image could help in explaining the difficulty in tracheal tube insertion in the section 4.1 (3). The written description was hard for me to picture.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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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