Reviewer 2 v.1

Comments to the Author

I had the privilege of reviewing the manuscript titled: “Duration of treatment with inhaled corticosteroids in non-asthmatic eosinophilic bronchitis: a randomized open label trial” by Dr. Zhan and colleagues.

Minor

1) in the introduction, please define sputum eosinophilia (i.e. > 2.5%)

2) in the introduction, change prevent exacerbations to “prevention of exacerbations”

3) in the introduction, change was to “is”

4) Please correct this sentence “We also excluded patients who were co-morbidity with gastroesophageal reflux disease and/or upper airway cough syndrome and/or other causes of chronic cough” to: We also excluded patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease and/or upper airway cough syndrome and/or other causes of chronic cough.

5) in the conclusion, change “release” to improve

Major

1) In the methods, study design. Regarding this statement: “All patients had previously undergone investigations and treatment trials to determine causes of chronic cough, as stated in Chinese Thoracic Society cough guidelines”. What treatment trials are you referring to? Please expand on these trials.

2) In methods, study design, why was 3 weeks selected as a definition of chronic cough? Most experts and guidelines suggest 8 weeks in adults.

3) Regarding this statement: “We also excluded patients who were co-morbidity with gastroesophageal reflux disease and/or upper airway cough syndrome and/or other causes of chronic cough.” Please explain why 32 patients had allergic rhinitis, as seen on table 1. If patients
with UACS and other causes of chronic cough were excluded, why were patients with allergic rhinitis included in the study?

4) Please describe is the how was diagnosis of GERD excluded? Was it by a patient recall/survey? Please clarify.

5) Under procedure the authors state that “blood laboratory assessments” were done. Were blood eosinophils measured? Any correlations?? I believe these results (even if negative) should be mentioned in the results section.

6) On figure 1. Are the authors sure that they had only to screen 106 patients and that only 101 did not meet criteria? That is a 95% success rate and is higher than expected for these types of trials in which there are multiple exclusion criteria. Please review figure 1 to ensure be sure that there were only 5 screen failures.