Reviewer’s report

Title: A randomized controlled comparison of non-channeled King Vision, McGrath MAC video laryngoscope and Macintosh direct laryngoscope for nasotracheal intubation in patients with predicted difficult intubations

Version: 0 Date: 18 Jun 2019

Reviewer: Alaa Khidr

Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for your great efforts, but I have some comments.

1. As you mentioned in your limitations ethically it is not accepted to try a new technique or device or doing a research in patients with a predicted difficult airway which I think from my side a major limitation of your work even with your results which showed no complications

2. I think it is not acceptable to insert an arterial line to monitor the hemodynamics, what is the problem with NIBP monitoring

3. I think Cormack-Lehan score is not applicable to VL because the difference in design of each blade and also the presence of the camera make it difficult to compare MAC with VL. BOGO score is used for VL.

4. I used both Macgrath and King vision VL and what I know is that the quality of the image with King Vision is HD with a higher resolution in comparison to MackGrath VL which is not HD with lower resolution and quality.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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