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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Dear Dr. Ruetzler,

Here are the replies to the reviewers, Dr. Martin Schlaepfer and Dr. Johann Knotzer on our manuscript " The Clarus Video System (Trachway) and Direct Laryngoscope for Endotracheal Intubation with Cricoid Pressure in Simulated Rapid Sequence Induction Intubation: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial " (BANE-D-18-00497R1).

Thank you for the kind and precious suggestions on the manuscript from both reviewers and the manuscript has been rewritten accordingly.

Every question is followed by an answer.
To Dr. Martin Schlaepfer (Reviewer 1):

The abstract has not been adapted to the manuscript for the changes requested by the two reviewers.

While the authors have partially conducted the post-hoc analyses as requested in table 2, neither the text in the abstract, nor the text in the results section has been adapted.

Please change the manuscript accordingly and report adjusted p-values for all study results where you state, that a treatment group was superior to another. For example the second paragraph in the results section still states that the first attempt success rate was higher in CVS-V and DL compared to CVS-L group, which it is not according to the text found in the legend of table 2.

Please revise the entire manuscript (including all sections) according to the suggestions of Dr. Knotzer (Reviewer 2) and my own comments.

Answer: We reviewed and revised the entire abstract and manuscript, especially in the result sections. We also made change on Table 2. The nonsignificant intergroup difference after Sidak’s adjustment for multiple comparisons for the log-rank test was also indicated.

Two statistical methods are applied in this study. First, we used the chi square test to analyse the intergroup difference for the first attempt success rate. The first attempt success rates within 30 seconds and within 60 seconds were higher in CVS-V and DL group than those in CVS-L group (p = 0.006 and 0.037, respectively). The post hoc test seemed to be unnecessary because both of CVS-V and DL group had the same first attempt success rate so that the difference was obviously between CVS-L group and either CVS-V or DL group. Second, we analysed the intubation time and demonstrated it with Kaplan-Meier curve. Even though the p value was 0.023 by the log-rank test, the intergroup difference was not significant after Sidak’s adjustment. Therefore, we stated in the manuscript that the first attempt success rate was higher in CVS-V and DL compared to CVS-L group.
To Dr. Johann Knotzer (Reviewer 2):

I have no further suggestions. The manuscript was re-written according to the suggestions to change the primary goal of this study in primary success rate and intubation time between groups. The manuscript improved as a whole. I have just one comment in the abstract of the revised manuscript. Please re-write the sentence "Primary outcome were to assess the effect of CP....." as this was the former goal of this study. In my opinion this manuscript is suitable for publication.

Answer: The sentence was revised on line 34-35 as “Primary outcomes were to assess the power of the CVS, compared with DL, regarding the first attempt success rate and intubation time in simulated RSII with CP.”

Finally, thank you and wish all of you have a nice year.

Sincerely yours.

Yung-Tai Chung