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Reviewer's report:

A detailed characteristics of idiopathic eosinophilic pleural effusion was described in the manuscript. The findings are interesting and useful in clinical practice. However, I have several comments on it.(1)The results were written poorly. Some information should be integrated into the Methods or Discussion section.(2)The methods used in tests for eosinophil, BNP or other tests should be characterized.(3)Exudates? or transudates? This should be detailed in the Results. In addition, fluid/serum protein ratio, or LDH ratio are preferable for the evaluation.(4)Written informed consent were not included in the study. This is a major fault.(5)As known, IEPEs were all exudates. However, case 7 was misdiagnosed as chronic heart failure. Why ?(6)Page 8, line 34, "Three were 5 male"; Page 25, "Table 3 Pleura effusion examinations", "Protein(g/dl)"?. These errors should be corrected.

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.

Unable to assess

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:
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