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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

The paper is well-written and well-designed study. I recommended some corrections before acceptance.

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

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

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

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.

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

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

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

Overall, the present study should be accepted and my congratulations to authors for excellent study.

Best regards.
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