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Reviewer's report:

General
The revision has significantly improved the manuscript. The aim of the study and the methods used are now better described.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. (Fig. 1-3) Sonograms are not widely used. Please describe the x- and y axis in the figures.
2. Some misprints (e.g. missing blank in the name(page 1), “..” (page 2),...) should be corrected.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
- Page 4: The “efficacy and accuracy” of lung sound measurements could not be demonstrated in this paper – more the “feasibility”
- Page 8: The significances are near the confidence limit and are likely accidental. After a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons they are not longer statistically significant. This should be noted.
- Page 9, page 10: “recent advances” – Please explain which advances do you mean, considering that the electronic lung sound analysis is more than 25 years old (see own references).
- Table 3: If you compare epinephrine vs. albuterol than the significances should only be marked in the epinephrine column. It would be more informative to add a column with the p-value as used in table 2. (see also point 2)

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions
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Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests