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Author’s response to reviews:

PULM-D-19-00509

Safety and utility of pulmonary function tests: a retrospective study from a single center over seven years’ clinical practice

Fei Li; Zhi-wen Huang; Huiwen Xu; Hua Yu; Yan-bin Chen; Jian-an Huang; Jia-jia Wang; Xiao-fei Wang; Wei Lei

The title of the revised manuscript: Safety and use of pulmonary function tests: a retrospective study from a single center over seven years’ clinical practice

Authors: Fei Li, Zhi-wen Huang, Huiwen Xu, Hua Yu, Yan-bin Chen, Jian-an Huang, Jia-jia Wang, Xiao-fei Wang, Wei Lei
We thank the editor and reviewers for showing their interests in our study. We have carefully considered the suggestions and constructive comments provided by the reviewers and have addressed them accordingly in the revised submission.

1. The safety issue has been addressed, but the utility issue is not addressed. I still believe that this study is more a study of medical practices in China than a formal description of the utility of PFTs; consequently the title should be: Safety and use of pulmonary function tests: a retrospective study from a single center over seven years’ clinical practice.

Response:

This is an excellent piece of advice. We have revised the title of the manuscript.

2. Results section, page 7: PFT (simple ventilation, 10 minutes), the authors should describe what is "simple ventilation" (that is not an usual description of PFTs). Is simple ventilation equivalent to spirometry measurement? Does simple ventilation include static volume measurement (dilution or pethysmography ?) ? Overall, PFTs should be better described.

Response:

We had revised this part in the previous edition according to your suggestions.

3. There were 4 diagnostic results of PFT[6, 7]: normal, obstructive abnormalities, mixed abnormalities, restrictive abnormalities. The manuscript has been modified as suggested previously. In table 2 legend the authors should had the definition of each defect that was used.

Response:

We use the same criteria as the reference 6 and 7. These definitions are a little bit long, so we don’t repeat the definition of each defect in the manuscript. If you want us to add relevant content, we can also consider revising this part.