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Author's response to reviews:

To,

The Editor-in-Chief

BMC Pediatrics

Respected Sir/ Ma'am,

Most humbly and respectfully, I'd like to express my gratefulness for highlighting the hitherto unrecognized typo errors in the results and body of manuscript. I'm highly obliged for your detailed scrutinization of manuscript. This also highlights the reputation of this esteemed journal of yours and assures me that the manuscript will be free from any errors whatsoever.

With regards to the revisions suggested by the editorial team, I've made all the necessary revisions as requested. I've mentioned below the changes made in the manuscript for your kind consideration:

1. In the abstract section of the manuscript, the comments by the Editorial board was "Abstract: [p<0.001; CI: 0.78-1.82]: what does CI refer to? The difference between HS and NS? In that case, I prefer [difference 1.31; CI 0.78-1.82; p<0.001].

   The suggested revision has been incorporated as [difference 1.31; CI: 0.78 - 1.82; p<0.001].

2. In the body of the manuscript the editorial comment was "p. 5, line 16: I suggest "after start of the first nebulization".
The suggested revision has been made and the language has been revised as "after the start of the first nebulization'.

3. In the results section of the manuscript the editorial comments were "Table 4: -0.73 - 0.40 (0.16) seems to be incorrect (first line of the table). For almost all data in the right column, there seems to be one minus sign (or hyphen) missed. E.g., I guess that the second line should be -0.11--1.21 or -0.11; -1.21. I prefer the second writing. Please, correct. Also, -0.25 - 0.37 (-0.61) must be incorrect (Oxygen saturation, first line)."

I must admit there must have been some typo errors in the past, which the editorial board has rightly identified and all the needful changes have been made.

For example, in Table 4, first line, the order of lower and upper limits of confidence interval has been revised and changed as -0.40;0.73 (0.16).

Similar changes have been made in all the results in the right columns in the order of lower limits of confidence interval; followed by upper limits of confidence interval (followed by mean difference).

The missing -/ hyphen sign has been added in all sections wherever it was missing.

In the oxygen saturation first line, the error has been rectified as -0.37;-0.25 (0.06).

I'd like to thank you again for highlighting the small but significant typographical errors in the manuscript and assure you that all needful amendments have been made.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Aayush Khanal, MD