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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed the reviewers concerns and I support publication.

There are still a couple of minor linguistic idiosyncrasies, particularly in the added text.

P5 l53. "BW is known as the predictor of PImax" - "a predictor" may be more accurate

P5 l54. P7 l9. P11 l31. P12 l6. etc. The phrase "PImax value was standardised by varying BW (PImax/BW)" appears several times and is not a strictly correct description of standardisation. The BW is not varied, it would be preferable to say that "PImax was standardised by BW".

P8 l12. "Three cases passed away after 48 hours of successful extubation in the failed group". The predetermined measure of success was extubation >48 hours. Should these infants not be considered successful extubation even though they died.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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