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Reviewer’s report:

The author described 2 cases of acute exacerbation that seem to be secondary to Pertussis infection. Acute exacerbation is a major concern in IPF and all therapeutical action that could prevent it should be emphasize. Vaccination again pertussis in this seating could be very interesting. However, the diagnosis of pertussis infection is poorly confirmed in this two cases and should be

Major comments

1) First of all, the cases did not encounter the CDC Case Definition of Pertussis. In the case definition of pertussis, Serologic testing can be used clinically to aid in diagnosis but are unfortunately not standardized. Is this test standardized in Japan.

2) The authors don't precise if exacerbation of cough have begun long term ago (at least 2 weeks). Did they have spasmodic cough?

3) If the infection is recent and explain the acute exacerbation of IPF, isolation of Bordetella pertussis from clinical specimen in culture or positive PCR should be showed. What about these tests in the two cases? Moreover, in this hypothesis, the serology should not be high.

4) Whether the cases were epidemiologically linked to a case that was confirmed by culture or PCR it could be used as a diagnosis criteria. What about the two cases?

Minor comment

Concerning the antibody titer, the cut off is very variable in different countries. The cutoff in japan population should be precise.

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.

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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