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**Reviewer’s report:**

The study report is still not clear. The comparisons that are made are between two medicated and highly flavoured lozenges and an unflavoured and unmedicated lozenge, yet the report refers to the placebo lozenge as an only an unmedicated lozenge. I believe that because of the design of the study it is not possible to determine if it is the difference in medication or the difference in flavouring that is responsible for the differences in outcomes. The authors should make this clear in the report and refer to the placebo as the unflavoured unmedicated lozenge rather than the unmedicated lozenge. The title of the study should also refer to an unflavoured unmedicated lozenge to reflect what was actually used in the study.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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