REPLY TO REVIEWER COMMENTS:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| COMMENT | REPLY |
| REVIEWER 1 |  |
| 1. The manuscript has grammatical errors that needs editing and correction | * The manuscript has been revised linguistically and all grammatical and spelling mistakes were fixed. |
| 1. Can you elaborate on what changes in therapy was pursued? Steroids, other immunosuppression, antibiotics, antifungals….   Can this be stated in the table with the various studies or independently? | * This is a review of literature. It involved many different studies originated from different centers and not all data were available, hence, it would be difficult to mention each change of therapy regarding each diagnosis obtained. * Moreover, a hint about the change of the treatment was added to the text (Page no.6; line 1-4). |
| 1. Is there information as to what segment/lobe of the lung was biopsied? This needs to be elaborated, was a particular segment chosen based on imaging studies? If there was diffuse disease, was any particular lobe targeted? | * Review of all papers included in the study was done and data was obtained regarding the method of OLB and targeted site of OLB. * This was shown in the table no. 3 |
| 1. Do the articles in that manuscript provide information of how many were placed ECMO or required lung transplantation? A brief mention of this is warranted in the discussion. | * Only two authors mentioned lung transplantation. Baumann et al. stated that two patients who had OLB were considered later lung transplantation (added at page no.6, line 4). While Charbonney et al. stated that one patient of those, who were included in the study had lung transplantation 22 months before. * No one mentioned ECMO. * These data are few and cannot add much to the discussion; hence, authors omitted it. |
| 1. What percentage of biopsies were open an VATS/thoracoscopy? | * Most of the approaches to get OLB were through thoracotomy as listed in table no. 3   Moreover, those who stated that there are some patients underwent VATS/thoracoscopy did not mention numbers for the patients. |
| 1. Table 5 states the mortality and survival column can be removed as this is just 100% mortality. | * Correction of the table was done |
| Reviewer 2 |  |
| 1. Very good and essential article. The paper is fluently written. The language can be improved. | * The manuscript has been revised linguistically and all grammatical and spelling mistakes were fixed. |