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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well-performed investigation, and well-written manuscript. I agree with the conclusion, and have very few suggestions for improvement.

The major question that remains for me is whether the observed differences between tNAVA and cNAVA (oxygenation, work of breathing as approximated by Pes, MAP, etc) were simply a result of the increased PEEP observed with cNAVA. Obviously, this is an area for further investigation, but it may be worth mentioning as a limitation.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
None

Discretionary Revisions
Although they represent secondary outcomes, you may consider including a figure to describe the changes observed in esophageal pressure and mean arterial pressure, as these may stimulate future areas of interest.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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