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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for requesting my opinion for the revision of the manuscript « Outcomes in Video Laryngoscopy Studies from 2007 to 2017: Systematic Review and Analysis of Primary and Secondary Endpoints ».

The article is clear, easy to read.

The purpose of this retrospective literary research is to provide consistent, recommendable outcomes for future research into the effectiveness and safety of videolaryngoscopes. The final result offers several recommendations for choosing the endpoints, but the fact remains that these endpoints are still numerous, which reflects the literature on this field. Perhaps the authors could have demanded a consensus limiting the endpoints to those most relevant and most clinical based from the experts. The example of "Laryngeal view grade" (CL AND / OR POGO), even if widely cited, does not reflect the difficulty of intubation in videolaryngoscopy (it is even recommended to intubate in CL grade 2: A deliberately restricted laryngeal view with the GlideScope® video laryngoscope is associated with faster and easier tracheal intubation when compared with a full glottic view: a randomized clinical trial. Gu Y. Can J Anaesth. 2016) and could have been less put forward by the experts (this point should be added to the discussion or the limitations).

A discussion of the clinical relevance of certain endpoints used in the literature could help the reader and the investigator to better choose the measurements to be made.

Page 6, line 22 to page 7, line 8: Selection criteria for the studies should remain in the methodology section, but the research results and Figure 1 should be in the results section.

Page 7 line 22 to page 8, line 2: Exclusion criteria for studies must remain in this section, but the number of excluded studies must be included in the results section.

Page 9, line 6: The Delphi Method description and definition are not necessary.

Page 9, line 7 to 17: This is the generic description of the Delphi technique, not specific to this article. More details should be added, such as the number of experts who will participate in the Delphi and why and the number of rounds planned (is it mandatory to a consensus or there is a number of pre-defined rounds? and why.
In the results section, we should find the results of this Delphi and better specify what did the Delphi add to enhance the literature research.

Page 12, line 19 to 23: This part should be included in the results section. In the limitation section, the authors should discuss only the fact that they have had a large number of studies not included, and the consequence that this could have on their results.

The first part of the conclusion represents the primary outcome of the study and should be included as the first paragraph of the discussion.

I hope this would help.

Issam.
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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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

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