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Reviewer's report:

It's an interesting topic. There is a lot of debate going on now, regarding the traditional direct laryngoscopy. Many studies showed that video-assisted laryngoscopy is superior, however, in general it is still been used in case of difficult intubation.

There are some issues needs clarification in the manuscript.

1. Video laryngoscopes have different designs. Blade design affects the glottic visualisation. If the authors used Glidescope®, Verathon, I recommend adding the registered trade mark symbol. If not, please, mention what specific scope was used and change the term Glidescope to video assisted laryngoscope.

2. P4 L88. "Vein channels" substitute with IV access or cannula.

3. P5 L91. Please explain why the authors used reinforced ETT.

4. The anaesthetists can't be blinded they know what modality they used intubating the study subjects. The term double blinded indicates that the observer bias is eliminated. I understand that the researchers and patients were blinded. However, the operators weren't, and they are key players in the intubation process. I suggest avoiding the use of the term double blinded as it might cause confusion.

5. Some sentences are long and make the manuscript difficult to read.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

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

Yes

**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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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