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### Reviewer's Comments

**Compulsory Revision comments**

1. Cross sectional study is a prevalence study. How did you find out incidence? (line 131, 132)
2. Only one swab was taken from each ear. For culturing swabs, media used were only agar plates (line 91, 92). Then how did you isolate candida?
3. Collecting 2 swabs from each patient, the number of total swabs should be 398. This number is not mentioned in statistical analysis.

**Minor Revision comments**

1. What was the treatment given for candida infection?
2. Will you prescribe quinolones for paediatric patients?
3. What were the ear examination findings of those 47 patients, (examined by specialist otolaryngologist)?

**Optional/General comments**

I prefer to use SPSS, than graph pad prism software for analysis. Except a few pitfalls in methodology, this study has succeeded in pointing out the importance of ENT examination in every cases of ear pain.
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