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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done an important work in systematically reviewing the economic burden data around bronchiectasis and also in proposing a framework for future studies. I have few minor issues

Results: the authors need to give background of the study population, were the studies in adults or children and what was the age range, presence of comorbidities and what were those adjusted in the results

Line 133-136: how did the authors differentiate between cost of management of bronchiectasis, cost associated with exacerbations and hospitalisation cost for management of exacerbations?

Line 173: "Instead, exacerbations accounted for the greatest proportion (34%) of the total costs" what does this mean. Do the authors mean that exacerbations led to hospitalization and that added to the cost or the use of antibiotics in exacerbations inflated the cost? This needs to be clarified.

Line 178: Total annual costs were higher in patients experiencing >2 exacerbations per year compared with no exacerbations" what about comparison between >2 exacerbations and <2? And in COPD patients with and without exacerbations?

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.

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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