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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to re-evaluate this manuscript after modifications.

Authors addressed most of the previous comments. The major previous comment was the lack of a study flow-chart. They provided it in this version.

However, from the study flow-chart, the total number of randomized patients is 90, while the allocation section in the figure has 3 groups of 18 patients (so 54 patients). I may argue that authors referred to 18 patients for each of the first 3 groups (PS of 8, 10, 12 cmH20), but in this form the figure is confusing for readers who may not understand this passage and may not be able to track patients flow in the study. Please modify the CONSORT study flow chart.

The initial number of eligible patient during the study period (1 March 2016 - 1 July 2016) is the exact number of included patients (and the calculated sample size). Does it represent the number of prospectively enrolled consecutive patients or a convenience sample?

Please modify the description of figure 3 as "Study flow - chart" or "Consort study flow chart", instead of "…flow diagram of the randomization"

Please modify the following sentence "We think the reasons may due to the application of 100% oxygen and nearly common minute ventilation"

Please consider if the following is in line with your message:

"This may be explained by the administration of 100% oxygen" and by minute ventilation almost reaching normal values"

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.
Yes

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

Yes

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable
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