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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear authors,

Thank you for sharing this interesting case report. I found it well presented, well documented, and easy to follow. I do recommend publication however, the manuscript needs to be revised significantly. 1. The authors should use the term "Perirectal" and not "Presacral" in the title since the authors use the term Perirectal more frequently in the abstract and main manuscript. 2. Similarly the authors should choose carefully between "perirectal" and "pararectal". I would recommend the authors to kindly homogenize and choose one anatomical word for localization. 3. In Figure 1, please either crop the image to focus on the region of the mass, or please cover up the wrist of the patient since the identity tag of the patient is still visible in the figure. 4. The authors must include histological microphotographs of the epidermoid cyst. Diagnosis of epidermoid cyst is a histological diagnosis and cannot be simply made based upon clinical and imaging modalities. The authors did mention sending the surgery material to histology and hence, those microphotographs should be included in the manuscript. 5. The authors should expand a bit more regarding the post-operative management of the patient -> medications, DVT prophylaxis, precautions etc. 6. The english needs to be revised extensively including removing the use of term obvious, obviously, generally, etc. Sentence structuring and grammar needs to be improved as well.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is well and good at innovation and clears the clarity of the reader. It is well structured and well written. The author does a good job of presenting a highly technical and complicated process in an easy to understand manner. Authors need to cross check the reference section by addressing the cited contents in the introduction and related work part. Also, The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Write your conclusions.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Well written case report. Please consider to add in the Discussion one reference after the
statement 'The differential diagnosis of presacral cystic lesions include tailgut cysts,
cystic teratomas, chordoma and anterior sacral meningoceles (17,18,19,20).’ The provided
references are not referring to tailgut cysts that encompass differential diagnosis as
rightly acknowledged by the Authors. One possible reference to add is:
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
I would like to thank you for submitting this manuscript. Although it is well-written in context of language quality, as it is presented, this case report presents 2 otherwise circumstantial findings. In this current form, it does not provide novel and significant knowledge to the literature. In my opinion, you should be more specific whether there is a supposed correlation between the presence of epidermoid cyst and sacrococcygeal scoliosis.