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Reviewer's report:
This paper addresses an uncommon problem which is lateral sphenoid sinus encephaloceles management. There has been several publications discussing this problem with various surgical techniques. The author here presents his experience in the management of these cases. The paper is generally well written and adds further confirmation of the best management of these cases using an endoscopic multilayer repair.

I would like to raise a couple of points for revision. In the results section the author presented his statistics concluding that there was a significant difference in favour of using allogerm inlay vs onlay techniques. There was only one case done using the onlay technique in this series and accordingly it would be difficult to conclude with confidence that the inlay technique would provide better outcome. The author does recognise the impact of the small number of this series, but I would suggest adding a statement in the conclusion section to clarify this point.

The author states that there was a learning curve with failure in cases 2 & 3 and none in the last 4 cases (Page 6, line 6). I would suggest revising this statement as it suggests that the failure of these 2 cases was related to the learning curve which contradicts the conclusions of the author regarding the different surgical techniques used in the repair of the defect.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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