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Reviewer's report:

Major

To a large extent, the authors have been responsive to my comments.

However, I still disagree with the authors that they are evaluating "the performance of the GLI2012 SRE among urban and peri-urban Zimbabwean children aged 7-13 years against a standard normal distribution". There is no universal standard normal distribution to compare the performance of the GLI2012 equations against. What they actually are doing is evaluating the distribution of their own data compared to the distribution of the data from which the GLI equations are derived. The fact that this is not clear to the authors is troublesome.

I also strongly disagree with naming the Caucasian GLI values for "Standard Normal GLI". This is not appropriate as Caucasians are not the "Standard".

Minor

In new Supplement 2, the authors present e.g. "Table 5: Multivariate analysis for spirometry variables and Socio-Economic Status (SES)" without a description of the method used. What kind of multivariate analysis was used for these results? Was it really multivariate models or perhaps multivariable models?

I still think that inappropriate modelling/methods of constructing the prediction equations is another potential reason for poor fit of SRE, that should be included in the discussion of this topic on page 5.

The conclusion in the main text is now appropriate, but the conclusion in the abstract still mention restrictive and obstructive lung patterns and I would prefer that the conclusion in the abstract would harmonize better with the conclusion in the main text.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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