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Zhang et al describe 9 cases of secondary PAP in a Chinese population. They add these to 155 other available cases in the literature to review a total of 164 cases of sPAP. The main limitation of the study is that there is little attempt to compare the Chinese patients to the at-large patients.

1. It is not entirely clear why sPAP related to dust exposure was excluded from the Chinese cohort, especially since several occupational exposures including silica are currently very high in China.

2. The authors state that examining whether there are racial differences in the prevalence of sPAP. But the methodology they used does not address this question. If there were a comparison of the fraction of sPAP compared to aPAP, or some other comparison of the features of the Chinese versus other patients, this point could be more fully explored.

3. The authors emphasized the absence of septal thickening in sPAP in the discussion, but the more frequently described difference, which was also present in their results, is the absence of a geographic pattern in sPAP. This should be noted also in the discussion.

4. Some of the terminology is non-standard for the English-language medical literature, including "debilitation", "emaciation", "dust exploration", and "vesicles" as a radiographic descriptor. Please define what these mean or use other terminology.

5. The Kaplan-Meier plot is useful, but it would be even more useful if the authors separated the hematologic causes from the other causes in the plot.

6. In how many of the 9 patients was the PAP the presenting issue?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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