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Reviewer's report:

This qualitative systematic review is a retrospective analysis of the primary and secondary outcomes in video laryngoscopy studies in the period of 10 years (2007 to 2017). It addresses a sensible question. It seems, that it also aims to isolate a core set of uniform outcomes, that can be used in future airway management research to facilitate consistency and standardization of results.

The title:

The title needs modification to incorporate the intent of recommendation of a core set of outcomes for further use in airway research.

Methodology:

Clarify, please your search criteria, see page 3 line 12: " different combinations of the term "video laryngoscopy ", please be more specific.

What were the exact inclusion and exclusion criteria used?

Was any software used when screening the studies for endpoints?

What criteria were used when assessing the primary studies methodological quality?

On page 7, line 5, 6, 7, please provide the complete list of items, including whole article names, authors, results year as downloaded from PubMed.

In the section Generation of recommendations, what is the authors intent, to provide a general information of how recommendations are made or is this a description of steps they followed in generating the CORE OUTCOME SET in table 2, see (page 8, lines 25, 26, 27 nd page 9 lines 1 and 2). It is difficult to understand the steps "1, First the scope was defined? ... followed by checking if a set exist ( what set?)

Third, a protocol for development of the COS was defined … : Where is that protocol described?

Why did the authors include "ease of intubation" outcome? Is there a validated scale of ease of intubation assessment, please provide reference? The "ease of intubation" appears in the conclusion section of the article, but is omitted from table 2, please correct.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare, that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal