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Reviewer's report:

This research is a randomised controlled trial comparing the first-pass intubation success of videolaryngoscopy and direct laryngoscope. Although this research results are very interesting, the author need to review the research method again. Moreover, the author should study how to write manuscripts.

Major points

1. Although, the author argues that "studies with 50 to 200 participants have small sample sizes", the participants of this study are as low as 100 people at maximum. Although the author is criticizing the low number of samples of past research, it is difficult to understand that this research is also using a similar number of samples.

2. The purpose of the study is unclear.

3. Despite claiming that "Evidence relating to different videolaryngoscopic techniques, such as direct versus indirect VL, also require further examination, as devices with different designs are unlikely to perform equally", different videolaryngoscopy (Glidescope and McGrath) are combined to give statistical results. This is a clear bias. The greatest advantage of randomised controlled trial is that it can get rid of such bias.

The authors should statistically processed by comparison between the three groups of Glidescope, McGrath and direct laryngoscope.

4. The author should study how to write a paper.

For example, the contents described in Background in abstract section and Background in body of paper are different.
Minor points

1. P4 L 10; 84.84%. Is this correct?

2. P6 L10-18; Only this paragraph has a different font.

The author should avoid such a simple mistake.
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