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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   #######As we diagnose "bronchiectasis" after chest CT scan in Japan, we usually describe from early/mild to severe bronchiectasis.
   # I think that you should not describe comparison frequency between diseases or races, if you use only chest X-ray.
   # Or I think that you should describe "bronchiectasis diagnosed by chest X-ray" in early paragraph on your paper.
   # We understand that "centrilobular nodules" are more common lung findings in HTLV-1 disease (not bronchiectasis) using chest CT scan in Japan.

>> 2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   #######Same upper 1.
   #######I think that you should put control patients of bronchiectasis of HTLV-1 negative.

>> 3. Are the data sound?
   #######Same upper 1.
   #######I think that "#Table 1#" shoud move from line 147 to 145 of Results.
   #######I think that you have to mention "the M#F ratio" from line 149 to 151 of Results clearly and easy to understand.
   ( refer#A paper said that ATLL was M>F, HAM was M<F.)
   #######It's difficult to understand from line 154 to 155 of Results.

>> 4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   #######These are differences words and numerals between Figure 1 and lines 139 to 141 of Results.
I think that you should put chest CT scan photgraph of your patients with bronchiectasis.

>> 5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

#######Sort of Yes.

>> 6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

#######Same upper 1.

>> 7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

#######Yes.

>> 8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

#######Yes.

>> 9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

#######The title is Yes.

#######The abstract is same upper 1.

>> 10. Is the writing acceptable?

#######Yes...But, after you will be done upper some revisions.

( The paper say "the only one of its kind in Europe." on line 106 of Introduction.)

# I think this paper is "Major Compulsory Revisions".