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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

The study was well designed and performed. The vestibular or otolithic dysfunction were found in SSNHL patients with vertigo compared to those without vertigo. However, this finding is not so novel and expected naturally. Furthermore, there are several points to be emphasized or corrected to be published. I think that your study is not suitable for this high impact journal.

I think if it is helpful for your re-submission, and I wrote several opinions.

In Methods section,

1. You collected patients with vertigo. This vertigo means only a symptom based word? Patients with vertigo did show nystagmus, and those without vertigo did not? We often experienced patients without vertigo showed nystagmus, catch up saccade, or canal paresis.

2. Healthy controls were included. The age was matched with patients group? The otolithic function will change by ages.

3. The methods of VEMPs are appropriate. But it is necessary to describe the detail. It is almost same in the previous articles.

In Results section

1. You need to insert the table which clearly describe the patients' profile.

2. You present the results of VEMPs in figures.

3. Amplitude asymmetry means AR? You should unify the expression to avoid confusion.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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