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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study that aims to answer the question of whether prior radiation therapy increases the difficulty of tracheal intubation. I applaud the authors for tackling this topic, as it is a common issue anesthesiologists face.

Some specific concerns:

1. Abstract- The hypothesis and how the groups were defined is unclear in the background and methods.

2. OCC vs OPC malignancy and the effects of treatment may not be the same. Is it fair to group them?

3. Why would some patients receive preoperative HNRT and others not? This could lead to confounding by indication. Please address. A propensity score method may be appropriate.

4. The authors matched patients on age, sex, and BMI. What about other issues that could affect airway management such as tumor type/location, obstructive sleep apnea, history of difficult intubation, etc.?

5. What about the time from HNRT to surgery? Would that have an effect on the development of fibrosis, etc.?

6. My largest concern is that all methods of intubation are not created equal. Saying an intubation was difficult because direct laryngoscopy was difficult is very different from saying intubation was difficult because fiberoptic intubation was challenging. I do not think it is a fair comparison to lump all methods of intubation together and compare whether they were "difficult." At least, one should look at DL +/- videolaryngoscopy separate from fiberoptic techniques.

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.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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 am able to assess the statistics

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