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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is now much clearer and easier to read. Thank you for the extensive revisions. A few minor suggestions.

Pg 14 Ln 14: The authors could be more clear about what values are being "interpolated" to "calculate" the results presented.

Pg 17, Ln 39: The authors should note, another assumption in their model is that all sizes of endotracheal tubes experience the same forces. But if a larger endotracheal tube was forced in to a ridge bony channel, it would experience larger forces than a smaller endotracheal tube.

Figure 1: May be superfluous since it is well described in the Methods that the diameter 2cm into nasal cavity is being measured.

Figure 4 seem excessive in a paper with 10 figures already. Instead, consider on page 11 Ln 46 in the methods referencing and emphasizing the "diameter equivalent" is a specific calculation in the appendix.

Figure 10: It should be noted in the legend that the pressure losses were at 30 L/min.
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