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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting comparative study which assesses concordance between pre transplant biopsies and explant examinations in patients transplanted because ILD.

The sample size is relevant for a single institution study and retrospective cases have been almost all re-evaluated by experienced pathologists. The concordance rate is higher that reported in previous studies.

Some limited criticisms can be raised

1) Authors state that "when original slides were not available,... the outside pathologist diagnosis was accepted" since this could represent a bias in the analysis, the exact percentage of samples that were not re-evaluated centrally should be clearly specified and, if possible these cases should be analyzed separately. It could be interesting to stress whether discordance was higher among these samples. In particular it seems interesting to rule out carefully SLB from patients initially diagnosed as UIP and lastly revised on EP as NSIP.

2) Was the longer duration from SLB to EP that was recorded among discordant cases, statistically significant?

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.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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