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Reviewer's report:

The authors very well describe their experience with Modified En DCR with T tube in this article.

Although, this sounds like a novel idea, it has been tried before with gelfoam used to appose the flaps around the intubation tubes.

Also the use of 22 controls adds no importance in the context of this study. Were these 22 control cases primary EN DCRs or failed? The success rates seem extremely low for even failed cases. There are previous case series where more success rate has been reported for revision EN DCR procedures.

(Ref: Surgical outcomes of primary and revision endoscopic dacryocystorhinostomy. Korkut AY1, Teker AM, Yazici MZ, Kahya V, Gedikli O, Kayhan FT)

Also was Mitomicin-C used in any of the cases? It has shown to affect the success rates in some studies.

The grammar and sentence construction needs to be improved throughout the manuscript.

(Abstract: Line 18: Spelling of receiving is incorrect Line 46: Using a T-type ventilation tube can significantly improve the success rate of surgery- Wrong grammar use)

A video of the procedure would be of more value as understanding the description of the t tube insertion procedure is not well understood.

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.

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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