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Reviewer's report:

I have read the article by Numata et al. with great interest. Although blood eosinophils were highly predictive in RCTs when evaluating response to mepolizumab, I support that evaluating patients' characteristics and comorbidities may have additive value in real life. The authors studied a small number of patients with severe asthma receiving mepolizumab and found that its efficacy is better in patients with ECRS. The article is well written and provide important clinical aspects which must be tested in broader independent cohorts.

Comments:

FENO. Did you perform 1 or 2 measurements? It might be worthy to cite the ERS technical standard document on exhaled breath analyses as well.

I understand that this is a retrospective study. However, a post-hoc power analysis on the primary outcome is still warranted.

Results. The abstract is clear that one patient has been excluded due to pregnancy. This has to be clarified in the text as well in the Assessment of all patients paragraph.

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:

Acceptable
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