

Dear Editor,

I want to thank you for your reply. I also want to thank the reviewers for their help and their valuable suggestions. The paper has been modified according to their comments. Changes in the manuscript have been highlighted in coloured text.

#### **Reviewer 1**

**In this manuscript, the authors review the roles of vitamin D in the pathogenesis of bronchoectasis in children. It discusses the regulatory role of vitamin D in immunity and inflammation and the epidemiological findings for CF and non-CF bronchoectasis in details. I have the following minor comments. 1. Please summarize the important information in figure(s) and/or table(s). 2. Ref 17 (Tanaka et al. Biochem J 204: 713, 1982) should be changed to Abe et al. PNAS 78: 4990, 1981, where the same research group reported the differentiation-inducing effect of 1,25(OH)2D3 in mouse leukemia cells. They also reported the similar effect in human leukemia cells in Miyaura et al. BBRC 102: 937, 1981. 3. Section 5 "Vitamin D and bronchoestasis; clinical ---", 2nd paragraph. What's PCD? Is it primary ciliary dyskinesia? Please explain about PCD or don't use this abbreviation.**

A table was added in the manuscript.

Suggested change was performed and both references are now included in the manuscript.

PCD is primary ciliary dyskinesia. The abbreviation is now explained in the text.

#### **Reviewer 2**

**Generally, this paper represents a good and comprehensive review about vitamin D and immunity, respiratory tract infections and bronchiectasis, especially not related to cystic fibrosis (CF). It describes in detail (maybe too many details) the current available evidence about the topic and its scientific quality is good. The structure of the manuscript is interesting and nicely approached. The references are pertinent. One of my concerns is that the paper is not easily to be read and followed. Every paragraph could be shortened and the same is applicable for some sentences (too long). Also, some information is redundant. Data could be summarized in some nice tables and diagrams/figures, which would really benefit the readers. The abstract could emphasize what is really important (including something about CF related bronchiectasis – there is nothing about that in the abstract). That would attract more attention towards the manuscript. In fact, there is no much information about vitamin D and CF related bronchiectasis, in this paper. The conclusion also does not contain anything about vitamin D and bronchiectasis in CF. Maybe it would be worth rewriting these paragraphs/reconsidering the ideas. Minor polishing of English language is required.**

Quite a few changes have been made in the text. Some sentences and paragraphs were shortened and some redundant information was removed. A table was added. Polishing in the

language was also performed. Both abstract and conclusions were changed so as to focus both on CF and non-CF bronchiectasis.

Reviewer 3

**The text is too long**

We made an effort to decrease the length of the manuscript without losing any important information.

On behalf of the authors

Kostas Priftis