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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

The revised manuscript has addressed most of the comments but I have still some minor comments.

As suggested by reviewer 1, the driving pressure needed to overcome resistive and elastic loads isn't a surrogate of WOB. To avoid confusion for the reader, despite the explanation made once in the revised manuscript, it seems preferable to avoid WOB and speak of driving pressure to overcome resistive and elastic loads all over the manuscript.

For exclusion criteria, page 7 in the material and method section you write that patients with consolidation greater than 1 quadrant were excluded and in the discussion section, page 15, you write "We excluded patients with more than 2 quadrants of infiltrates". Please check it.

The reference 22 used in the discussion section "so our pathophysiological findings may differ from moderate or mild disease" is not the good one because this reference is a randomized controlled study on HNFC versus CPAP in bronchiolitis but does not address physiopathology. Please correct it.
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.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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