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### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported the clinical importance of multiple disciplinary team (MDT) in rare primary splenic malignancy. There are some comments. Comments 1. In Figure 1, post-operative CT image should be deleted. 2. In case 2, pre-operative CT image should be indicated as Figure.
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1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper’s scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes
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11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and
appropriate? No. Paper needs Improvement.  13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes  14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes  SPECIFIC QUESTION. IN THE SECOND CASE, PREOPERATIVELY MALIGNANCY WAS SUSPECTED. STILL THE AUTHORS WENT IN FOR LAP SURGERY. HOW WAS THE SPECIMEN TAKEN OUT? WHAT WAS THE CHANCE OF TUMOUR SPILLAGE? HOW WAS IT ADDRESSED.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Kindly expound on the epidemiology of splenic malignancies, that can confirm its rarity and therefore would warrant a multidisciplinary discussion. The case summaries were elaborate and described the clinical presentation very well. Maybe, an additional review of literature on how to diagnose clinically and pathologically these rare splenic tumors can be included. The roles of each member of the MDT should also be highlighted since the manuscript basically reports the importance of an MDT.