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Reviewer's report:

The following issues have to be fixed before publication:

Firstly, the study was conducted in the very specific cohort: patients after extubation. The study gives impression that all patients after extubation should be treated with NIV, which is not true. This issue should be shown more clearly to justify the use of NIV in included subjects. Following papers should be used: Esteban NEJM 2004, Chien-Ling Su Respiratory Cate 2012, Nava Crit Care Med 2005, Ferrer AJRCCM 2006, Ferrer Lancet 2009, Hess Respir Care 2012.

Moreover, indication to NIPPV must be clarified. On the one hand, authors said that the aim of NIPPV was providing respiratory support, but on the other hand they admitted that indication to NIPPV was not respiratory support but low ability of airway protection and cough strength. What does it mean?

Secondly, there are many other inconsistences in the text. e.g. it is said that all patients used total face mask, but in table 4 the use of oro-nasal mask and facial mask was reported? And the next question arises: whether subjects were proposed a change of interface, if total face mask was not tolerated?

Thirdly, the structure of the manuscript is still not perfect. In abstract: the sentence "the use of sedation … could protect … from failure of NIPPV" sounds more like conclusion not result. In Discussion there are data (about OI), which should be given in results.

Fourthly, there are many linguistic errors, unneeded repetitions.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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