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Reviewer's report:

This is a case report of adverse events following percutaneous computed tomography-guided lung biopsy. The report is well detailed and relevant to clinical practice. However, I have a few minor comments that need to be addressed.

Abstract.

Background: Fine

Case presentation: Fine

Conclusion: It reads more like a recommendation. Needs to be revised as it does not capture the findings

Keywords: should be words that do not appear in the title

Introduction: The condition is well described; however a statement highlighting the rationale for this case report is needed

Case presentation: Fine

Discussion: The first sentence is repetitive. It appears in the introduction

P9 lines 26-30: The subheading in bold is not necessary

P9 line 58: subheading not relevant

P10 line 33: subheading not relevant
Conclusion: This is a repetition of that in the abstract and does not summarize the findings of the case report. This needs to be revised to reflect the findings before this recommendation.

References: Fine

Table 1: Fine

Figure legends: Good

Figures: Fine

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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