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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Thank you for your comments and your interest in our manuscript.

The manuscript has been revised according to your comments and we have made some minor clarifications in the manuscript.

Below you will find a detailed description of the response to each of the comments.

1) I noticed that it is confusing number of patients.

1- in abstract, the number of patients was 87
2- in results, it was not stated.
3- in table-1, it was stated as 75.
4-in SPSS analysis table, it was stated as 87.

Which is correct?

We are sorry for the discrepancy of number and that this was not corrected earlier. The reason for the discrepancies was that 12 of your patients did not fill out all the clinical questionnaires and thus were omitted from part of the statistical analysis.

The manuscript has been revised accordingly:

ABSTRACT

Changed number of patients to those with all questionnaires.

(page 2, line 17-19)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Revised the right number and added:

Of the 87 patients included in the study 12 patients (4 CRSsNP, 5 CRSwNP and 3 septoplasty patients) had not fully completed the questionnaires and thus were omitted from the statistical analysis.

(page 6, line 9-12)

2) I think that the statistical analysis of manuscript should be more specified although there was no statistical errors.

Recommendations:

Specify the statistical analysis methods.
According to the editor recommendations we have rewritten the section under DATA COLLECTION with description of statistical method:

The data were analysed using SPSS 23 IBM. The results are reported as mean values. One-way analysis of variance, ANOVA, was used to compare biofilm formation, LM CT score, SNOT-20 and its subscore between the CRSsNP, CRSwNP and the Septoplasty patients. Student’s t-test was used to assess the significance of the mean differences for time to referral, VAS, LM CT score, SNOT-20 and its subscore between CRSsNP and CRSwNP. Pearson correlation was used to evaluate the correlation between Lund Mackey CT score and SNOT-20/VAS, and correlation between SNOT-20 and VAS.

(page 7 line 2-9)

The description of Table 1 was changed:

Table 1: The mean values were calculated for each parameter. One-way ANOVA was applied to calculate the significance of differences between CRSsNP, CRSwNP and septoplasty patients. The student’s t-test was used to identify differences between CRSsNP and CRSwNP.

(Page 8, line 18-21)

The manuscript has been revised according to the editor comments, and we think the revised manuscript has been significantly improved.

We hope that you will accept the revisions done, and consider the new manuscript for publication.

Sincerely Yours

Øystein Eskeland

MD, Otorhinolaryngology