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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thanks for recommending me as a reviewer. This paper was to analyze the audiological characteristics of a rare condition of acute otitis media (AOM) associated sudden hearing loss and evaluate the efficacy of a combination therapy of tympanostomy tube placement (TTP) and intratympanic methylprednisolone injection after failure of conventional medical therapy. If the authors complete minor revisions, the quality of the study will be further improved.

1. Eight subjects were enrolled in this study. In this case, it seems more appropriate to use a non-parametric test rather than a T-test, which is a parametric test.

2. Authors need to be more specific in the discussion section about the reasons for their findings (results).

3. The following references are too old studies. It is necessary to change to the latest research.

Ref#1. Media AAoPSoMoAO. Diagnosis and management of acute otitis media. Pediatrics 2004; 113: 1451-1465 [PMID: 15121972 DOI: 10.1542/peds.113.5.1451]
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