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**Reviewer’s report:**

Minor Essential Revisions

Table 1 and figure 1 not clearly marked.

In a previous crossover study we compared CLiO2 with two different manual control strategies in 15 infants during 8-hour test periods.

In the above-mentioned sentence, the two difference should be “two different”.

spelling mistake

Please mention what evening effects are as pointed by me in the review document and mentioned by the authors in the methods section.

Major compulsory revision

The narrower range in the intended target range (93-87 SpO2) did increase the time % in the < 80% spo2 as 1.7% (3.1-0.5) p =0.052 .

Authors have not mentioned this fact anywhere as 0.052 lies just close on the significant level if p<0.05 is significant.

Also worth mentioning about the level of significance, p <0.05 or p<0.01?
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