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1. Please re-review our instructions for authors that you can find at our website

   - We already reviewed the instructions for authors in the journal website and made correction regarding general format of the manuscript as below;

   1.1 Use double line and spacing format

   1.2 Use line and page numbering

   1.3 Change colored table to non-colored table (table 1 page 6 line 133; table 2 page 6 line 143; table 3 page 7 line 153; table 4 page 7 line 156; table 5 page 8 line 164; table 6 page 8 line 169; table 7 page 9 line 176)

   1.4 Lists of abbreviations were added (Page 10 line 215-217)

   1.5 “Acknowledgements” was added (Page 11 line 232)

   1.6 “Authors’ information was added (Page 11 line 233-239)

2. Abstract should include the subheadings of "background, methods, results and conclusion"

   - Correction was made in the abstract section to include subheadings of “Background”, “Methods”, Results” and “Conclusion” (Abstract section Page3 line 55,58,64 and 69 respectively)

3. 'Introduction' should be amended with 'Background'

   - Change “introduction” to Background” (Page 4 line 80)

4. The aims of study should be added at the end of the background. To the best of my knowledge, the SNOT-22 has been previously validated in Thai language in the study of Numthavaj et al

   - The aim of this study is already stated at the end of the background section. Although the paper of Numthavaj et al. was already published before, our study was conducted at the same time without knowledge of each other’s work. The purpose of our study at the first place was to validate and translate the questionnaire to Thai language, not to improve what has been done by the other research team. Fortunately, as we believe, our data and results give more insight regarding validity and reliability of
the questionnaire which some of them have not been demonstrated in the previous study. We already added this issue in the discussion section.

5. 'Materials and methods' should be amended with 'Methods'

- Change was made from “Materials and methods” to “Methods” (Page 4 line 98)

6. Discussion should be improved with comparison of the study of Numthavaj et al. and the present study

- Improvement of discussion was made by adding these sentences (Page 10 line 196-202);

“There was a study of validity and reliability of Thai-language SNOT-22 published in January 2017 by Numthavaj et al. showing that Thai SNOT-22 is valid and reliable in Thai CRS patients [15]. Even though the results regarding validity and reliability are not different between the previous and the present study, we provide more data which were not demonstrated in the previous research. Those are the data analysis compared SNOT-22 with SF-36/ Lund-Mackay score, SNOT-22 score in normal control compared with CRS patients. Moreover, we also demonstrate that the Thai-language SNOT-22 questionnaire has good responsiveness/sensitivity to change, which has not been analyzed before.”

7. The limitations and the strength of the present study should be added into the discussion.

- The limitations and strength of the present study was added in the discussion (page 10 line 203-207);

“This study has its strength in the terms of the reliability and validity. The discrimination power of SNOT-22 Thai version can be shown statistically by the change of scoring after surgical intervention. Nevertheless, the minimal clinically important difference (MCID) should be further studied in order to determine it discrimination power in the clinical practice. The limitation in our research is we did not study CRS with polyps and CRS without polyps separately. If there was difference between groups, our study results would be changed to some extent.”