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Reviewer's report:

The authors revised their manuscript in some points according to my comments. However, I would like you to change in one point. In my first review, I wrote "But I would like you to understand the aim of our study and I would you to make some comment in the discussion. I would like you to modify p.12, line 17-18." You have added some sentences on page 13 and page 23; however, you do not understand the aim of our study, sufficiently. As Suzuki et al reported, prognosis of AE-non-IPF ILDs is similarly poor to AE-IPF. We have also shown that prognosis of AE-non-IPF IIPs is as poor as that of AE-IPF (Arai T, Respirology 2017). So additional treatment is also needed for AE-non-IPF ILDs. In addition, all clinical IPF cases could not be diagnosed according to IPF guideline without surgical lung biopsy specimens. We have planned our trial to make some evidence about thrombomodulin for such cases of AE-non-IPF IIPs. So I would like you to add some comments in the discussion session like below; "Prognosis of AE-Non-IPF IIPs[34] [Arai T, Respirology 2017, doi: 10.1111/resp.13065] and AE-Non-IPF ILD[19] is similarly poor to that of AE-IPF. Efficacy of thrombomodulin was suggested for AE-non IPF IIP cases in the report of Arai et al.[34]. Hence, thrombomodulin might be effective for AE-Non-IPF IIPs although additional trial might be needed."

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