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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is focused on management of IPF patients. There is a need of carefully designed surveys that investigate this crucial point. However, the structure of this study needs to be improved. I have also several concerns about the results. The discussion should be improved.

Methods

- Page 6, line 55. How was the questionnaire administered?
- Page 6, line 55. Please detail how the questionnaire was translated and validated. Reference #13 is not sufficient.
- Page 7, lines 41-46. The new "attitude questions" should be reported.
- Statistical analysis. Odds ratio should be calculated for the comparisons that have been done.

Results

- Page 8, line 22. It seems that 115 physicians visited IPF patients in the last year. According to the inclusion criteria, the remaining 340 physicians should be excluded from the study. Why Authors have analyzed 455 questionnaires?
- Table 1. Please, provide number of pulmonologists who answered questionnaire.
- It would be of interest to know duration of symptoms before the diagnosis of IPF. Please, specify in detail in the text.

Discussion

- It should not begin with data on smoking. This is not the main question of the study. Overall, in the discussion results should not be repeated but commented.
- An important limitation of the study is that responses to the questions should be considered subjective.

**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.

No

**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:
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