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Reviewer’s report:

The subject matter is topical but needs to be clarified better in the introduction. No mention is made of objective measure and why these were not used and why the 'Nose ' questionnaire was not considered for the assessment of nasal patency.

The study does not clarify the degree of septal deviation and hence it is a subjective clinical diagnosis which then leads to implying that improvement in the RfIT group is due to missed septal deviation. This is a major issue with the paper. No comment on whether decongestant spray was used as an assessment of the mucosal component in causing the nasal obstruction.

The number of pts in the study is good. However the outcome data is confounded by the inclusion of revision cases. Some who have had turbinate surgery and now are having septal surgery or repeat turbinate surgery, who will have an inherent bias of surgery outcome. Also the fact that there are more oral breathers in group 3. There is also an issue of the percentage of pts with allergy, smoker in each group which needs to be discussed. Maybe the higher number of smokers cannot sense the improvement in the nasal airway and hence score lower?

Why are nasal polyp pts included, will the nasal polyp disease not confound their scores?

I think the author needs to have a look at their paper and streamline it to reduce all the issues raised above. If this can be done, I am happy to review the revised paper.

Data would have been better represented as box plots..

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.

Yes

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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