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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for letting me review the second revised version of the manuscript "Regulating Autonomic Nervous System Homeostasis improves Pulmonary Function in rabbits with Acute Lung Injury", authored by Yan Liu et al.

I appreciate the authors' efforts to improve their manuscript, but unfortunately there are still some issues with this manuscript, which I think have not been clarified yet.

Statistics and Figures: The authors now state that they had already changed SEM to SD in the previous version. Looking at the figures from the initial submission as well as from the versions R1 and R2, I really have to say that the size of the error bars in figures 1-5 look very similar in most of the cases when comparing the three versions of the manuscript. What's the explanation for this? Please comment.

In my previous review of Version R1 I had asked about the bupivacaine dose. Unfortunately, the point-by-point response by the authors only includes information about pentobarbital (which I didn't ask about).

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.

No

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 am able to assess the statistics.

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

Needs some language corrections before being published.
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