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RESPONSE TO REVIEWER 1
We wish to express our appreciation to the reviewer for the insightful comments, which have helped us significantly improve the paper.

Comment #1
I think that their comment on post-hoc power analysis should also be part of the manuscript in Result section and Discussion.

Response #1
We appreciate the reviewer's comment.
Based on the reviewer’s comment, we have added the following sentences in each section:

1) Moreover, we reevaluated several primary outcomes by performing a post-hoc power analysis.
   P10, line 3-4, (“Statistical analysis” section)

2) We performed a post-hoc power analysis regarding the following primary outcomes in all patients, which are shown in Table 2: ACT score, daily dose of OCS and exacerbation. The power was over 0.80 except for the daily dose of OCS in all patients (0.62) (data not shown).
   P11, line 7-10, (“Results assessment of all patients” section)

3) The power was over 0.80 for the three primary outcomes in the ECRS group, however it was 0.31 for exacerbation in the non-ECRS group (data not shown).
   P12, line 8-10, (“Assessment of asthma patients with or without ECRS” section)

4) ~ with the power was greater than 0.80 according to the post-hoc power analysis (data not shown).
   P14, line 17-18, (“Previous treatment of omalizumab” section)

5) To increase the reliability of the statistical analysis, a power analysis was warranted. Thus, we performed a post-hoc power analysis regarding the primary outcomes in every group.
   P17, line 15-17, (“Discussion” section)