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Reviewer's report:

IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION OR SUBJECT STUDIED
The study of eosinophilic pleural effusion is a very important topic for research.

The objectives are clearly stated


ADEQUACY OF APPROACH

The experimental design seems adequate

I would like to clarify why were patients with pleural effusion or pleural pulmonary involvement scanned by chest high-resolution computed tomography (HRCT) excluded?

Acceptable from an ethical point of view.

RESULTS
The data are clearly presented
The first paragraph (page 8, lines 20-28) seems more methods than results, hence I think it should be placed in the methods section

It seems important to know how long these patients were followed.

Tables and figures OK
It seems interesting to know which were the final diagnosis of the EPE patients excluded from the study. Although it is described in table 1, a brief sentence about the characteristics of chest X ray seems necessary in the main text (how many were bilateral, how many were unilateral-left and how many unilateral-right).

DISCUSSION

The discussion is relevant and adequate to the data presented
The authors recognise their limitations

Page 9, line 42: "surgry " would probably be "surgery"

REFERENCES

The references are rather old
I suggest some more recent references

GRAMMAR AND STYLE

The writing clear and easy to follow
I think that English language is satisfactory, however I’m not a native English speaker

ABSTRACT

Adequate and well structured

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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