

Author Response 2

Thank you very much for your careful reading our manuscript and providing many helpful comments. We revised our manuscript according to your suggestions.

1. We split this sentence into two sentences.
2. We revised this sentence to understand it easily.
3. In this study, we did not consider non-fibrotic ILDs such as cellular NSIP and OP to be ILD. Chronic fibrosing ILD, such as fibrotic NSIP, was considered to be non-IPF-ILD, and was included in this study.
4. We added a p value.
5. We revised this paragraph to understand easily which is discussed, LD or ED.
6. We describe the number of cycles of the first-line chemotherapy as a fact. We would like to say that the rate of patients receiving less than three cycles of first-line chemotherapy was higher in IPF patients. Multivariate analysis showed that less than three cycles of first-line chemotherapy was associated with shorter OS in IPF patients. This is a retrospective study, and we can not conclude that fewer cycle number is a cause of shorter OS.
7. We changed "PFS and OS" to "progression-free and overall survivals"
8. We revised this sentence as suggested.
9. We broke this sentence into two sentences. We left brackets to see data easily.
10. We removed these words as suggested.
11. We revised this sentence.
12. Response was assessed according to RECIST, version 1.1. We added this information in the Materials and Methods, and added a reference.
13. We deleted this part.
14. We revised this sentence and added an additional sentence.
15. We moved this discussion part from the limitation paragraph.
16. No.19 and No. 20 were deleted.