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Reviewer's report:

1. Competing interests section in title page is incomplete

2. In both abstract and main body of manuscript - it is claimed that subgroup analyses will be conducted based on "actual lung physiopathology" - and this is used as the basis to claim (in discussion of abstract) that this is study applies the best trial methodology to neonatal ventilation (a rather bold statement in itself). However, the subgroup analyses specified are rather generic, and I am not sure will adequately distinguish underlying lung pathology. In my view, the importance of this needs to be de-emphasized if the subgroups will indeed remain as described.

3. Under primary outcomes - clarify whether duration of IMV is post-randomization or all time?

4. CPAP PEEP levels - limited to 8 cmH2O - may consider higher PEEP level

5. Weaning from study interventions - the weaning off from NIPPV doesn't make sense as written. States that PIP will be reduced to 3 and PEEP down to 5 (PIP cannot be lower than PEEP) - revise

6. Please ensure language/grammar are verified - there are a lot of errors throughout the manuscript.

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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