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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions
1. Line 53: “Of the 43 bCPAP-eligible infants for whom bCPAP was and was not initiated” probably should read ‘Of the bCPAP-eligible infants for whom bCPAP was and was not initiated”
2. Line 76: “intensive care unit technology for respiratory support” instead of “intensive care unit technology for respiratory distress”

Results
3. Line 179: How come the unusual outcome of more survivors in the bCPAP eligible but not initiated than eligible and initiated. Also there were referrals in the eligible and initiated group whereas the eligible and not initiated did not have any referrals? Yet no record of complications Could this in anyway be suggesting that bCPAP in that setting portends more danger than not giving it?

Possible selection bias was suggested in the discussion but with the guidelines provided for the identification of respiratory distress, is it possible to carry out a subgroup analysis to determine the severity of respiratory distress in those eligible who had bCPAP or did not

Anyway, this is one of the drawbacks of retrospective reviews
4. Though not specified in the methodology, but I presume the oxygen saturation in the study was measured by pulse oximetry, if it is so, I suggest the abbreviation SaO2 be replaced with SpO2

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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