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Reviewer's report:

The revised manuscript certainly has improved readability and is a clear presentation of the current literature on the cost of bronchiectasis divided into appropriate headings. In particular the results section is well headed up throughout. Documentation of costs for this disease remains an important area of work to determine potential impact and cost saving for future interventions.

The abstract is clear. The opening paragraph in results is good setting the scene and now the results section is well headed up throughout. The days of hospitalisation (means etc) are still at 2 decimal places which seems a bit exacting - i.e. mean 6.9 days versus 6.91 days - just means that latter figure is easier to forget.

Minor points:

Line 77: 'episodes of exacerbation' to 'exacerbations'
Line 155: 'an estimated of the resource use' to 'estimate'
Line 342: 'using patient records or claims is likely to underestimate' to 'are'
Figures are good and Figure 2 now when printed off in black and white is discernible.

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.

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