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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the authors The article with the title “retroperitoneal congenital epidermoid cyst misdiagnosed as a solid pseudopapillary tumor of the pancreas: a case report” is in generally well done, but I would offer these comments to the investigators:

1) Several words throughout the manuscript appear to be merged. Please correct it.

2) Some grammatical errors occur. The manuscript contains significant language-related issues. Please correct these types of grammatical errors throughout the paper.

3) Introduction: “Retroperitoneal epidermoid cysts are a rare disease....” Please add the incidence in the general population. “Rare disease” is not enough.

4) The reference list is quite old. Authors should focus on recent papers and papers older than three years should except for an overriding purpose.

5) The authors mentioned that “Postoperative pathology showed an epidermoid cyst with infection”. Please explain what kind of bacteria was detected”. Did this infection affect the postoperative patient’s course?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors have successfully described an interesting case of Retroperitoneal Congenital Epidermoid Cyst misdiagnosed as a Solid Pseudopapillary Tumor of the pancreas. Overall, the case report is well written, but is in need of some grammatical and language polishing.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Excellent and interesting case of quite a rare disease. Excellent review of epidermoid
cysts, and the uniqueness of this case is one of this manuscript's strengths. There are
minor grammatical errors, for instance: 1) Abstract Case Summary: "although imaging
examination indicated that the mass probably originated from the pancreas, and it was
considered a solid pseudopapillary tumor of the pancreas (SPTP), the surgery
revealed...". Consider changing to : "Because imaging indicated that the mass probably
originated from the pancreas, it was considered a solid pseudopapillary tumor of the
pancreas (SPTP). However, the surgery revealed..."