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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Tamara Hughes,

Title: Blood cells for the differentiation of AECOPD airway inflammatory phenotypes
Journal: BMC Pulmonary Medicine
Submission ID: PULM-D-19-00034R5

Thank you for your advice and the valuable comments.

We have addressed the comments raised by the reviewer and editor, carefully proof-read the manuscript to minimize typographical, grammatical and bibliographical errors, and would like to re-revise (language service?) it for your consideration.

We acknowledge the comments and suggestions very much, which are valuable in improving the quality of our manuscript.

I sincerely hope this manuscript will be finally acceptable to be published. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely

Dr Gao

Editor Comments:

Please have the text edited by a professional language editing service or a native English speaking colleague. There are many issues with grammar, wording, spelling, and/or punctuation that need to be addressed before your manuscript can be considered for publication.
Dear editor, thanks for your advice and the valuable comments. We have addressed the issues with grammar, wording, spelling, and/or punctuation in the paper, and would like to re-revise (language service?) it for your consideration. As an example:

Line 15: "Measurement of sputum is frequent to define" - suggest frequently used….
Our answer: We have revised the sentence (Line 15 Pages 2).

Lines 21-22 "A weaker but correlation was between…" - suggest There was a weaker correlation.…
Our answer: We have revised the sentence (Line 21-22 Pages 2).

Line 28: "Eosinophil and neutrophil parameters were relationship between sputum and blood."
Our answer: We have revised the sentence (Line 28 Pages 3).

Line 39: "…are response in…"
Our answer: We have revised the sentence (Line 39 Pages 4).

Line 42: change "up to 10-40% is a feature" to "is present in 10-40% of patients"; eosinophilia to eosinophilic *2, and "were reported" to "shows" or similar.
Our answer: We have revised the sentences (Line41-43 Pages 4).

Line 45: Suggest …"Four airway inflammatory subgroups were defined by the percentage of eosinophils and neutrophils in sputum:"
Our answer: We have revised the sentence (Line 45-46 Pages 4).

Line 47: "there is a need applicable..."
Our answer: We have revised the sentence (Line 49 Pages 4).

Reviewer reports:

Stephen Bourke, PhD (Reviewer 1): The authors have addressed my previous concerns. Thank you. There is one further minor point which could be resolved either by removing reference 25 from line 210 or alternative wording.

Line 210 refers to RCTs (in the pleural) of blood eosinophil directed prednisolone therapy. Only Mona Bafadhel's study assessed blood eosinophils as a biomarker to direct prednisolone therapy. Reference 25 (Siddiqui et al) is a post hoc analysis of the FORWARD trial data, assessing blood eosinophils as a biomarker of response to inhaled ICS/LABA v LABA.

Our answer: Thanks for your suggestion. We have revised the sentence (Line 212 Pages 21). There are two repetitive literatures in Ref. and we have revised them. We have addressed the issues with grammar, wording, spelling, and/or punctuation in the paper, and would like to re-revise it for your consideration.