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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is an interesting original research article. It provided a new approach for using surface electromyography in diagnosing various types of dysphagia.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. In the Electromyographic techniques section, the authors need to clarify where the electrodes were to record submental activity, same side or opposite side of the operation side?
2. On page 8, the authors have mentioned that they have performed surface EMG with simultaneous fluoroscopy for five volunteers. In the results section, it was reported that the results showed synchronism between stages of swallowing and sEMG graphic patterns. Please elaborate if there is any distinct relationship between swallow stages and various muscle activation patterns.
3. The last line on page 9 there is a typo "locaation"
4. I recommend the authors report both 24h and 72h results in one table.
5. In the discussion section, the authors mentioned when dysphagia was caused by salivary gland dysfunction the traces from masseter are higher in amplitude in contrast with dental extraction. Is the above-mentioned results a group study or case study and it needs to be referenced.
6. On page 12, in the discussion section, the authors indicated that the reduced masseter activity post-surgery was due to the fact that a patient tries to spare the operated site. But the surface EMG was measured from the side opposite to the operation site. Please clarify this in the discussion section.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.