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Reviewer's report:

the paper is original, the study well conducted, the topic interesting

I have just some comments:

1 patients from 20 to 70 years are very different: were the exercises more effective in older patients? could you comment?

2 how did you choose the exercise time(5MIN)?

3 please, I'm very purist, do not call Cricoid compression the BURP maneuver! for difference please read Sellick's historical paper. Please correct cricoid compression with laryngeal compression (as in table 3) or BURP

4 page 7 line 50:you describe the rescue plans in case of a difficult laryngoscopy. please explain differences from your protocol and ASA/DAS guidelines in case of difficult intubation

5 why didn't you cut the nasal surgery cases? they can confuse the data concerning oropharyngeal injury

6 if you used TOF monitoring please explain 2 cases of vocal cords mobility

7 did you explain to yourselves the high incidence of CL IIIb in your groups? IIIb is a very difficult intubation grade!

8 page 13 line 31 "was performed at the beginning....." please explain better this sentence (therapy is the exercise?)

9 page 16 line 15:can you quantify how long the effect of the therapy last? it would be interesting in practical clinical routine

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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