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Reviewer’s report:

The changes made by the authors have significantly improved the paper.

I still however have issues with the exclusion of data considered 'outlying values'; however this may potentially be a misunderstanding of the sentence. From my understanding these participants met no other exclusion criteria - they did not have any identified respiratory conditions, were not exposed to excessive smoking, BMI not below -2 z-scores, and had acceptable technique. If these participants were excluded because you queried sufficient effort and that this in turn caused low FEV1 and/or FVC values, than this is a reason to exclude off technical grounds. The ATS/ERS guidelines state that a maximal forced manoeuvre must be performed. In it's current form I interpret this statement as participants were excluded because they fell too far on either side of the normal population distribution. This is bound to happen in the real world - some patients will be far lower or higher without any identifiable health history. If participants have been excluded based off your definition of Median +/- 1.5 (IQR) but are still considered healthy, how can you be sure that the recommendation that the GLI-Other/Mixed is an appropriate fit for your cohort and these participants as you have now excluded them?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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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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