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**Reviewer's report:**

This is mostly a prospective non interventional study which aims to investigate the prevalence of respiratory symptoms in a representative sample of Ethiopian farmers compared to non-farmers.

The results show that there is an increased incidence of obstructive and restrictive pulmonary function impairment in farmer than controls.

There are some concerns about the results.

**Major concerns:**

- All the value are expressed in liter, but because there are some differences in age and other values (height and weight are not showed) it would be important to show also the value in percent of predicted.

- Methods: "Lung function test results also showed a higher prevalence of obstructive (15.6% vs. 10.8%, p = 0.085)". Authors should point out that is not significant.

- Results: line 207. the authors should clearly distinguish statistically significant results from those that are just tendentially but not statistically significant. According to table just cough and phlegm were significant.

**Minor concerns**

- Abstract methods. I would delete this: "Statistical analysis (Chi-square, independent sample t-test, binary logistic regression and linear regression) of the data was done using SPSS version 23"
If it is possible in the introduction I would add the estimated number of Ethiopian farmers.

Authors should make clear what type of work the control group did and what type of agriculture the farmers are involved in.

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.

Yes

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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