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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Dear Reviewer

Thank you very much for your revision.

We provide here a point-by-point reply to your comments and queries.

We really hope that, with your insights, our revised version of the manuscript may be suitable for publication in BMC Pulmonary Medicine.

Bets Regards

The authors
REVIEWER 1

Comment: I think that the abstract should include that NIV mode was not used in the present bench study, and also that leaks were nearly zero. I consider that these points are crucial and thus included in the abstract, so that a reader can have a closer idea of the type of study performed here.

Reply: Thank you for your comment. We inserted the suggested information in the abstract.

Comment: Please check the abstract length, as many words are stuck together.

Reply: Thank you for your comment. We revised the form of the abstract. We are sorry for the inconvenience.

Comment: Please clarify whether the simulated infant was 3.5 or 5.5 kg (3.5 in the abstract and 5.5 in Methods).

Reply: Thank you for your comment. We corrected the weight of simulated infant consistently in the abstract and methods section. The correct weight is 5.5 kg. Sorry for the inconvenience.

Comment: Results. 2nd sentence. Please provide more information about the trend "toward an increase of the delivered VT during Respireo NIV compared to the FPM". Figure 3 does not allow the reader to know the VT delivered with each interface. And please provide the VT per kg with each interface.

Reply: Thank you for your comment. We noticed that we had uploaded a wrong version of Figure 3, which did not allow the readers to know the delivered VT. We now uploaded the correct figure showing the VT delivered with each interface. Moreover, we provided the VT per kg with each interface in the Figure Legend as requested. We are very sorry for the inconvenience.

Comment: Discussion. "The VT delivered to the mannequin was between 6-8 ml/Kg, although, during ET, VT showed a trend toward an increase compared during NIV…" Is Respireo missing there (compared during Respireo NIV)?

Reply: Thank you for your comment. Yes, there was a missing word in the text. We inserted the word “Respireo” in the sentence. We are sorry for the inconvenience.