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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for addressing the reviewers comments:

I have just some minor additional corrections please and then i am happy to accept

Abstract paragraph one needs re-writing:

Consider changing to:

"The aims of this study were to retrospectively re-evaluate a cohort of patients with IPF according to the 2011 international IPF guidelines to 1. Characterise the patients according to different courses of disease progression and 2. Evaluate whether CPI, GAP or other clinical factors could predict mortality."

Page 3 Line 22 : Change to :"using the 2011 international IPF guidelines"

Page 4 Line 2: :as well as the" should be "as well as other"

Page 6 Line 3: As per Felix Chua comment I think it would be helpful to note that the re-evaluation of HRCT to Definite UIP was based on analysis of both first and second HRCTs - and how far apart was the second scan from the first? -

Page 6 Line 5: in HRCT should be "on" HRCT

Page 6 Line 6: 47 patients evaluated in MDD - please explain and breakdown which patients were discussed in MDD and how you decided which to discuss

Page 7 Line 7: There were 12 cases characterised as not UIP on HRCT…Do you mean 9 of the 12 patients characterised as not UIP could not have a biopsy due to …

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal