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Reviewer’s report:

Many thanks for responding to my comments, the English has improved and is now slightly easier to read the paper. Unfortunately I still have some concerns.

1. The statistics still require a review by a statistician

2. Your choice of patient has limited your results. Because of the retrospective nature you could have included all patients with TAO, including those who did not have ivGC (including those graded as severe and who were excluded). This biases your results and limits the conclusions you can draw from this.

3. Roc curves and discussions on diagnostic accuracy have no place in this retrospective audit.

4. I am afraid I sill don’t understand where an ex smoker falls and what a passive smoker is.

5. Did you have all data points for all 90 patients. How complete is your data e.g do you have smoking status for all 90, if not how many are you missing data this helps with reliability of your data.

6. Do you have comorbidities of your patients. This may impact on your outcomes.

7. On table for inclusion exclusion criteria- number 5 is exclusion. This sold be in a separate row, maybe just split table into 2.

8. In your non responder group they have an average CAS of 2. Your definition of response is a drop in 3 factors. So you have artificially created a non responder group.

9. Your results and methods section have overlap. Please keep each section seperatly.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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:
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