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Main body:
Introduction:
In the introduction it's better to mention the outcomes in terms of objective/aim/research question of the study not as the list of feasibility/primary/secondary outcomes.

Sample size:
I really don't get what the authors want to say here 'we used a one sided 80% confidence interval approach based on our feasibility objectives, which was an effect size of 5%, to estimate our required sample size. (18) (19) The effect size of 5% was based on binary outcomes of the incidence of first pass intubation success.'

Need more clarification. The authors can follow the guidelines how to write sample size section.

Statistical analysis:
It's not clear the types of outcomes. It's better to mention which method was used for which outcome- not general statement. Also, nothing mentioned what type of effect estimates were reported and whether confidence intervals were reported.

Results:
In table 3, several IQRs were reported. Were these IQRs or Q1-Q3?
Table 4, what does this mean 'Recruitment rate n=100''?
Figure 1, no reason for exclusion mentioned.
Results were reported for only two methods 'Pearson's Chi-squared test' and 'Wilcoxon Rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test'. Why so many methods were mentioned in the statistical analysis section. Further, nothing was mentioned in the results section the results of checking normality, but it was mentioned in the statistical analysis section, why?

Why no confidence interval was reported? It's better to report confidence intervals rather than p-values.

Discussion:
The authors said this was an effectiveness trial. I was wondering whether the authors know the difference between effectiveness, efficacy and pilot trial?
This manuscript needs major revisions in the areas discussed above.
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