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Reviewer's report:

The authors in this manuscript describe a validation study to determine the reliability of using surfactant protein D (SPD) as a diagnostic marker for ARDS by combining the results from three cohorts. Overall, the data is compelling although as the authors note not novel since they validate previous studies.

The manuscript is very short and the concerns are with a number of writing errors (listed below) other than the concern with novelty and impact on the field. One suggestion for the authors since they have the data is to evaluate the strength of combining the data for both procalcitonin and SPD.

Minor/major comments

Page 5, line 17 put a space between [2]and
Page 5, line 52 put a period after [6,10,11]
Page 6, line 7 rewrite considerations into mind
Pages 7&8, use past tense
Page 8, line 17 490xg
Page 8, line 19 remove therefore
Page 8, please provide information that a calibration curve was also conducted
Page 8, there is no information on how any of the other assays were done that are listed in Tables 1 and 2.
Page 12, line 22 period after [10]
Page 13, line 34 change bigger to larger
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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