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Reviewer's report:

The Authors of this paper describe the results of a survey about the practice, management and treatment of IPF by pneumologists and non-pneumologists in Latin America. This study is intended to be one of a series of preliminary studies in order to improve the IPF guidelines in Latin America.

COMMENTS

- This kind of study, even if preliminary, needs a rigorous methodological approach. The title and text suggest that the results could be representative to physicians of Latin America. Correctly they supposed that the enrollment of physicians attending medical meetings could be a bias. Maybe they should consider that the inclusion criteria (enrollment of some delegates of two "general" Respiratory Medicine congress in only two countries) do not consent to consider as representative the cohort of physicians of all Latin America. A table with the nationality (express in %) of respondents must be provided.

- P5L34-36 From "using" to the end. this is not a part of the aim of the study. The authors should consider to move this sentence before (in the real introduction) or after (discussion).

- In order to understand the difference between pneumologists and the others, the Authors should provide the distribution (in %) of the specialization of the respondents.

- It is not clear what the Authors mean with "access to pathologist etc". If all of them had to answer about the characteristics of their patient with IPF according to ATS/… criteria, it is likely that they are part of or collaborate with a MDT. So why only less than 30% had access to a MDT. On which basis they diagnosed IPF?

- The influence of some drugs' prescription's "rules" should be better investigate. E.g., in some countries only cardiologist can prescribe sildenafil.

- The data collect do not permit any inference about the difference between European and Latin American IPF patients (cough vs dyspnea).
- P9 L44 Is this a subtitle? The last paragraph of Results section needs a subtitle as it is not dealing with the comorbidities.

- P11L5-13. The meaning of this sentence is not clear.

- The conclusions' paragraph is not about the assessment of management etc of IPF. Moreover the Authors' recommendations are not suitable in this section.

- English should be deeply revised (e.g. P6 L14 ".. answered in the affirmative…"). Be careful of spelling (e.g P12 L7 dyspnea instead of dyspnea).

**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.

Unable to assess

**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.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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