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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript is substantially improved. The authors have done an excellent job to revise this manuscript and present these important results in a clear and concise way.

A few minor suggestions:

1. In the abstract the conclusion could simply state ' that use of the GLI could help in interpretation of pulmonary function tests

2. In the introduction page5/line7. The GLI are endorsed by the ATS/ERS. Specific recommendations are committee specific and not universal across the societies.

3. Methods - page 7/line 52 and throughout. please change 'race' to 'ethnic'

4. Discussion - page13/line 19, i think the authors mean multivariable not multivariate

5. Discussion - since this is a study focused on paediatrics i'm not sure whether the discussion of COPD and the fixed cut-off is necessary

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.
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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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I am co-Chair of the GLI Network and discussed these results informally with the co-authors.
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