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### PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | 1. Inclusion & Exclusion criteria not mentioned  
2. Questioner details not mentioned |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | 1. Include few commonest causes for FOB  
2. Does the FOB test in the present study was standard if so details  
3. Discussion part still can be improved  
4. Limitations of the study has to mention  
5. Current literature is not cited |
| **Optional/General** comments | 1. Conclusion part to be improved  
2. Ethical clearance details not mentioned: Has to specify with details |
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