

Peer Review File**Article Information:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ajo-20-85>**Reviewer A:****Comments:**

Overall an interesting paper which will add value to the scientific literature.

Parts of the introduction and discussion could be rewritten to be more succinct. The introduction in particular is longer than necessary. Given that this paper is likely aimed at practicing Otolaryngologists and Radiologists who do not require such detail regarding sinonasal anatomy this could be better summarised.

The response rate of 129/459 is low and perhaps should be mentioned as a possible limitation in the discussion.

Mention of the "authors feeling", "authors suspicion", "authors opinion" and "authors acknowledge" in the discussion should ideally be rewritten in a more formal manner

Author Reply- Many thanks for your review and comments on our article.

In response to your suggestions, the introduction and the conclusions have been reduced significantly with the addition of a clarifying statement as to the dual intents of the article: reporting of the results of the research as well as a brief introduction to the subject area.

Reviewer B:**Comments:**

Overall, a good review which is relevant to everyday practice and topical.

There are a few minor grammatical issues and some inconsistencies with referencing, but worthy of publication.