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Reviewer's report:

General comments

This is a well-done randomized controlled trial. The manuscript is well-written, needing only some minor revisions.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Abstract

Results: The mean reduction in clinical score in each group (3.57 ± 1.41 vs. 2.26 ± 1.15, p = 0.001) rather than the percent of patients who had significant reduction should be presented. The percent of patients were ready for discharge and the relapse rate in each group should also be presented together with p values.

Conclusions: The authors concluded that "Nebulized 3% HS is effective, safe and superior to Epinephrine alone for outpatient management of infants with mild to moderately severe viral bronchiolitis ...". "Epinephrine alone" should be replaced by "0.9% normal saline" because this trial compared hypertonic saline with normal saline.

2. Methods

Study participants, Inclusion criteria: There are duplicates between study participants and inclusion criteria. The authors should combine the text of these two parts.

Interventions: In this section, the authors mixed interventions with patient assessment. Interventions and controls and patient assessment should be separately presented.

Statistical Methods: In the last phrase of this paragraph, the authors described that "Dependent variables were compared by Student t-test. Statistical significance was defined as p-value < 0.05.". "Dependent variables" should be replaced by "continuous variables".

3. Results:
In the second paragraph (lines 13-15, page 9), the authors described that "There is also a significant difference in the mean change in CS scores, HR, RR and SpO2 between the two groups at the start of treatment and at the end of 2 hours of therapy (p <0.001).". It seems that "at the start of treatment" should be withdrawn from this phrase.

In the last paragraph (lines 19-20, page 9), the authors described that "During the subsequent week, 78 out of 100 patients (Group 1, n = 37; Group 2, n = 41) were accessible". The data of the Table 7 should be briefly presented after this phrase.

In this section, the verbs should be past tense, but the authors used present tense in some places, such as "There is gradual improvement in CS score ...", "There is also a significant difference in the mean change in CS scores, ...".

4. Discussion

Interpretation, Conclusion: There are duplicates between interpretation and conclusion. It seems to be unnecessary to present "Interpretation" in a separate paragraph.

5. Figures

Figure 2 should be withdrawn.

6. Tables

In the Table 4, column 5, "95% Confidence Interval". It is not clear which measure this 95% CI I refers to. I suppose that it refers to the difference between group means.

Table 5: "at the end of 2 hr of treatment" should be added in the title of table 5.
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