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Reviewer's report:

General
This paper aims to evaluate the efficacy and accuracy of the use of computerized quantification of wheezing and crackles and a clinical score for measuring the effect of treatment in infants with RSV bronchiolitis. The presentation is markedly improved from the original submission.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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. In table 2, the p-value column should be removed. Since the groups were assigned by randomization, there is no reason to attempt to quantify the probability of observing such a result by chance. In the text, replace the sentence that begins, “There was no significant difference. . . .,” with something more along the lines of, “The groups were well balanced in terms of demographic and clinical measures.”

2. In the results section, when you state that patients with higher clinical score tended to have higher crackle and wheeze counts, include the Spearman correlation and the p-value in parentheses at the end of the sentence.

3. In table 3, replace “N.S.” with the actual p-values.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

4. In the statistical analysis section, ‘Numerical and Categorical’ should not be capitalized.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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