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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed almost all my comments. Nevertheless, some comments have not been addressed adequately.

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.

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.

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.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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