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Reviewer's report:

1- Pag. 4, rows 26-39: the authors included in the late-onset noninfectious pulmonary complications after allogeneic HSCT (i.e. after +100 days) BO, COP, DAH and IPS. However according to ATS 2011 the time of onset for IPS ranges from 4 to 106 days and DAH occurs in early post-HSCT, indicated median time of onset at 12-15 days.

2- According to ARS 2011 the time of onset for IPS ranges from 4 to 106, in the study population the median time from transplantation to diagnosis was 44.5 months

3- Neither PPSE nor IP were included in IPS classification of ATS 2011

4- Table 2: No patient with BO have bronchiectasis and only one patient with BO has pneumothorax; however, both bronchiectasis and pneumothorax are frequent in BO patients

5- Symptoms and onset of symptoms in patients are not clear

6- Pag. 9, rows 38-46: pulmonary function tests presented as pre-diagnosis were those before HSCT or those performed after HSCT at median of 12.6 months after HSCT (range 5.0-40.2 months). In my opinion, this range is too wide and not accurate in identifying the development of late restrictive lung defect because the patient could have moderate restrictive lung defect due to early BO

7- Pag. 11, rows 14-16: "IPS is generally defined as noninfectious widespread alveolar injury with restrictive pulmonary defect after HSCT". PPFE and IP lack the evidence for widespread alveolar injury
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