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Reviewer's report:

The author addressed several of my previous comments. The length of the manuscript is now reasonable. The proportions of "triggering successes" (i.e., pulses aligned with inspiration) are presented in Table 2. I would have liked to see some formal statistical comparisons (p values) in this table. Is Device B really different from Device C? These proportions are reported on the 78 final consecutive breaths of the breathing sequence. Why 78? It seems to me that this number is small. Finally, I do not see anything about the volume and flow of oxygen delivered. Visual inspection of Figures 4, 5 and 5 indicates that the flow and volume of oxygen that is delivered is different among the 3 concentrators. I understand that the focus of this study was on triggering however. Otherwise, this version of the manuscript is much improved compared to the original one.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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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.
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