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Reviewer's report:

General Comments
The language is easy to follow and the illustrations of high quality. The main limitation is the lack of treatment and outcome details. How are the readers to judge if revision surgery successfully managed the patients’ symptoms and resolved the CT abnormalities. The authors comment on this limitation in the discussion will be helpful. Discretionary

Methods
The Lund-Mckay scoring system is referenced but the authors score each side independently when there is bilateral disease, which is at variance with this system. I can see no reason for this approach. Therefore recommend Page 4, delete last sentence. Major Compulsory

Results
The results should be summarised in the text such that the salient findings are clear without reference to the tables. Major Compulsory

Discussion
Page 6. Please clarify/comment on lateralisation of the middle turbinate. Is this caused by adhesions between the middle turbinate and lateral nasal wall? In the discussion the studies referenced describe lateralisation (Musy and Kountakis), adhesions between lateral wall and middle turbinate (Lazar et al) or adhesions between the lateral nasal and a lateralised middle turbinate (Ramadan). Are these not all the same thing and is the important factor not the adhesion rather than the position of the turbinate? Major Compulsory

Page 7, line 13. Please provide references to support the statement that more aggressive surgery is indicated. Discretionary

Table 2. Major Compulsory
Revise by presenting the data for all CT scan sinus findings rather than restricting to “worse” side. The illustrated CT scans show the limitation of this approach when there was almost always bilateral disease.

Re-label for clarity. Minor Essential
delete “(Lund-Mackay score zero, one and two)”.

Replace in column 2 “free from disease” with “no sinus opacification”. Minor

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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I have mentored the first author who is one of my ex-trainees and a current research collaborator. One of our co-publications is referenced in the article.