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Reviewer's report:

After reading the manuscript, I have the following concerns:

1. The title of the study mentions clearly non-difficult airway, however only 63.5% of direct laryngoscope patients had glottic view of I-II, this means 36.5% of the patients in the direct laryngoscope patients were grade III or more and here the following questions must be answered clearly:
   - Were these patients predicted during preoperative assessment as difficult airway or not?
   - Were any of the patients in the glidescope group predicted to have a difficult airway or not?
   - No clear inclusion or exclusion criteria written clearly in your methodology regarding the prediction of airway difficulty. As this is related to the primary outcome of your study, it must be stated clearly
   - What was the management plan for the 36.5% of the patients in the direct laryngoscope group who had grade III or more view? These are difficult airway patients; how did you manage them and were these patients expected or non-expected difficult airway?

2. As the study is not blinded as you mentioned in your methods, please correct this in the title of the study.

3. There is a confusion on what video laryngoscope you used especially when you responded to the previous review. Please add a clear figures or videos for the video laryngoscopy you have used during your study. It is very important to give the readers the right message about the device used.

4. Please, when you respond to any corrections required, make relevant changes in the manuscript and make these changes in a different color to enable us to follow the corrections you make to the manuscript.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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