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Reviewer's report:

I thank the authors for their responses and revisions to their manuscript. The document is much improved. The additions are helpful in clarifying the methods used and limitations are more clearly disclosed.

I remain unconvinced by the author's argument about using glottic visualization as the primary endpoint with the more clinically relevant intubation success as the secondary. I will leave this to the discretion of the editor.

Minor issues:

Abstract lines 4 -5. "The goal was to _show_ the benefit…"

I don't think this is the word you are looking for. It implies you are trying to prove your prior belief that VL has a benefit, thus getting the scientific method backward. I'm sure this is a translation issue. I would suggest something like:

"the goal was to "evaluate the impact VL compared with DL on intubation success and glottic view during CPR performed by German paramedics".

Thank you again for your responsiveness.

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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