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Reviewer’s report:

Dear colleague,

Thank you for the revision. Your explanation for the retrospective registration and the change of fiberoptic scope was sufficient to my opinion. Many items were improved, however some issues remained and were not addressed in your rebuttal.

Regarding the results:

1. In table 3: Half of the data is uninformative. For instance, it is clear that if 62 attempts have been performed and 13 were successful, that 49 must have failed. So that row is abundant. More informative will be the percentage and the p-value between groups.

2. Furthermore, in the text you stated a significant difference between groups (line 224-225): what is the effect size? what is the p-value?

3. Line 226-227: what is the effect size? (please state n(%) --> e.g.: Rusch 20 (40%) vs ETT 30 (60%), p=0.092)

4. Line 235: I still don't understand why this number is too small for significance testing. It is a binary outcome which could fit in a cross-table; why does a Chi-square doesn't apply?

5. Line 236-238: please mention p-values. Is this number indeed significant?

Tables/figures:

1. In my opinion there are too many figures/tables, which could be combined. Still, I'm not the author, so I leave that between the editor and the author.

Discussion:

1. In my opinion it can be shorter, but again, I'm not the author.
Hopefully you will regard these remarks as constructive, and feel free to disagree, but please explain why.

Kind regards, Mark Koning
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