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Reviewer's report:

General Comments:

This interesting paper by Cortegiani and colleagues is about a survey among a small number of specialists in NIV concerning the identification of the 10 most influential studies ever published on NIV in the critical care setting 2) summarization of the reasons for the selection of each study 3) insights on the future for both clinical application and research on NIV. Ten experts that were chosen by citations in the "Web of science" selected 10 best papers on NIV with the explanations about their preferences. Then the experts suggest that innovative new interfaces more adaptable to patients characteristics, the need for good well-designed large randomized controlled trials of NIV in acute "de novo" hypoxemic respiratory failure (including its comparison with HFNT) and the development of software-based NIV settings to enhance patient-ventilator. Synchrony will be good as future issues to be studied and applied.

Specific Comments:

1. It is interesting to add the ranking votation in table 1.

2. What about patients selection and outcomes?

3. The discussion section must be improved adding some insights explaining why the success of High flow nasal therapy in hypoxemic respiratory failure compared to NIV. The authors must add some discussion about the possibilities of NIV settings (PEEP, Tidal volume, inspiratory pressure, synchrony) and NIV success and danger of VILI.

4. What about humidity, warm gas and inspiratory flow during NIV application?

5. The authors must improve the study conclusions at the end of the paper.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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