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Reviewer's report:

This is a good paper describing detailed characterisation of state-of-the-art esophageal physiology measurements in a cohort of Chinese patients with IPF. The paper illustrates the different parameters measured by different techniques and the associations (or lack of) between them, and highlights that “typical” GERD symptoms are poor markers of abnormal esophageal physiology in IPF.

Major corrections (compulsory)

The authors should define early in the paper what they define as “gastro-esophageal reflux disease”, “GERD+” and “GERD-”. I presume the definition is based on 24h esophageal pH.

Comment on the validity of the various “normal values” described in the text and tables. What is the normal population and how does it compare to the demographics (especially older age) of the IPF population?

Comorbidity is common in IPF. The authors should justify why patients with comorbidities were excluded from the analysis, thus skewing the population studied.

P4 line 88 explain what is the “standard questionnaire”

Include some discussion of acid vs non-acid reflux, including discussion of the high prevalence of abnormal physiology in the GERD- group.

Discuss why the GERD+ group had more weak peristalsis

P9 line 208-210. The authors claim that screening should be performed in IPF, but the their results do not directly support this claim. This would require a study of screening vs conventional care in IPF and comparison of outcomes.

Line 210-212. Suggest replace this sentence with “Further studies are required to determine whether treatment of reflux and abnormal esophageal function alters outcomes in IPF”, or something similar.

Minor corrections (compulsory)

A number of spelling or grammatical errors

P2 line 29 delete “predictive”
P3 line 61 define EFT
P6 line 139 “were” not “was”
Line 141 “are shown” not “was showed”
Line 144 last sentence is clumsy.
Table 1 spelling “Heartburn”

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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