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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study into the effectiveness of semi-structured briefings prior to a simulated critical event. The authors appropriately note the various limitations of their study and findings. Of interest, the briefing did not result in a difference in the primary outcome measure of time to decision to perform cricothyroidotomy. The Discussion highlights the findings, the implications of the findings and hypotheses for future study. Concerns: Table 1: please confirm the entries for numbers of inductions / standard deviations; if data are not normally distributed then median and IQR may be a better way for the reader to understand this data. The Discussion appropriately notes the difference between this briefing and a checklist; do you think that reference to a more detailed script than the TEAM mnemonic would be of value?

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:
Acceptable
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