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Reviewer's report:

The authors have presented a study comparing endo DCR alone vs endo DCR with otologic T-tubes. Unfortunately the authors have not provided any clinical information regarding the 'control' group and hence comparison of the two groups is difficult. The authors mention 'There were no significant differences in age or gender distribution between the experimental and control groups' but do not specify any further information - had the control group undergone external vs endoscopic/were there more repeat cases/were there more complicated cases etc etc. Furthermore, the authors report a 'significantly' higher rate of complication with the conventional endo DCR vs DCR with tubes but do not actually specify what these complications were - the second line of table 3 is obsolete and provides no additional information. The authors are encouraged to revise this manuscript such that the two groups can be adequately compared.

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.

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

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 am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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