

Reviewer 2 v.1

Comments to the Author

#### General comments

1. It would be clearer to the readers if the authors would refer to their previous study as their own work. Eg. Page 29, Line 24 "A recent study by Santos et al..." should be changed to "Our recent study..."
2. Similarly, the authors should reference studies by other authors when referring to "results (that) were similar to those found in the literature (Page 30, Line 5).
3. Could the authors comment on why only one technique was used to evaluate angiogenesis. Why were other markers of angiogenesis not quantified, ie. vWF, amphiregulin, or endothelin-1?
4. Could the authors comment on the length of time the mice were challenged with OVA? Other studies use much longer exposure times (several weeks) before culling for angiogenesis assessment.

#### Major Changes

1. The IHC is rather unclear. Please provide images with higher DPI.
2. Please provide quantification of vessel area.

#### Minor Changes

1. Please display graphs as dot plots and indicate that the full cohort of 8 mice is quantified for each measurement.
2. Please provide standard deviations or interquartile range in graphs instead of standard error of the mean. It would be preferred to provide effect sizes as well.
3. It is not indicated in the figure legends what the red arrows are indicating.
4. Please include exact p-values in the manuscript.