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Reviewer's report:

Major points:

The request to state a hypothesis has not been answered. The Background section still devotes most of the space to address treatment approaches of RSV bronchiolitis instead of presenting a case for objective documentation of clinical signs. The explanation for not calculating sample size and statistical power needs to be part of the manuscript instead of a reply to this reviewer. There is no mention of advice from a biostatistician.

Minor points:

The automated crackle count is now explained as "änalogous to one previously published by Murphy". Later it is stated that "in the off-line auditory audit of the data there was agreement between clinician and PulmoTrac results in all sound segments which were analyzed." This study was obviously not designed to provide validation of automated crackle counts similar to the verification of wheeze detection that was published in ERJ 2003. The lack of validation of the crackle counter should be mentioned.

The reply to questions regarding noise interference, exclusion of data and time required per study should be part of the manuscript and not just an answer to this reviewer in the cover letter.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes