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Dear Editors of BMC Pulmonary Medicine,

after having received the reviewers comments we have revised our manuscript. All revisions are visible in our new manuscript. Please consider our comments concerning the reviewers’ complains:

Referee 1 (Venerino Poletti):

1. We have added clinical and diagnostical criteria in our manuscript in the “methods” section. Radiological characteristics are described in the “results” section.
2. As described, all samples were taken using a flexible bronchoscope in local anesthesia (no intubation or rigid bronchoscopy).
3. The size of the cryoprobe as well as the used gas were added in the manuscript.
4. The cryoprobe was taken about 1-2 cm from the thoracic wall. This is a normal and safe distance. Furthermore, as reported, no severe bleeding or pneumothorax occurred. The histological figures included in the paper mainly show mainly lung tissue, in specific:
   a. Figure 1: the right picture shows a bronchus with attached (lung) tissue, the left picture shows lung tissue with only one small bronchus on the top left
   b. Figure 2: only one piece shows a bronchus wall, the other two pieces show only lung tissue with focal fibrosis
   c. Figures 3 und 4 are enlargements of lung tissue in Figure 2
5. The criteria for UIP as well as other morphological patterns was defined more clearly in the revised manuscript in the “methods” section. Additionally, as reported in the paper, two experienced lung pathologists discussed and agreed on the histological diagnosis.
6. One specimen was 22 mm in diameter due to a long fragment of bronchus mucosa with attached lung tissue.

Referee 2 (Ersin Gunay): No revisions recommended.

Referee 3 (no name given):

1. The cite of ref. number 11 was added in the revised manuscript.
2. The period of time of the collection of the data was added in the manuscript.
3. As described, there were no major complications in the bronchoscopy procedure.
4. We did not use the student t test. This was wrong and was corrected in the revised manuscript.

Additionally, we have stated in the methods section that we have received a waiver for the study. Furthermore, the Authors’ contributions section was integrated.

We hope that you will now consider our newly revised manuscript.

Best regards,

Sergej Griff and Henrik Wurps.