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Dear Editor  This is an interesting case report but the introduction section needs major enhancement. Thank you for inviting me to review. Ahmad
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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This manuscript reports a patient with multicentric recurrence who survived after diagnosis of gastric subtype of IPNB for at least two years without curative resection, and suggests that if there is no histopathological evidence of malignancy, observation may serve as a reasonable alternative. Generally speaking, it proposes new concept for the treatment of gastric subtype of IPNB.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The case in the article provides a new idea for the treatment of IPNB, and it is a very good and special case. However, there is little content about the latest progress of IPNB in the article. It is recommended to increase the background content and increase the current disease-related research progress. Modify the formatting errors in the text. And look up the literature to prove whether the case in the text is an individual case.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting case report of recurrence of a bile duct tumor after detachment of the primary neoplasm. The follow-up images are very well-suited and the manuscript is of high quality. However, the manuscript needs some revision before it becomes suitable for publication. Given below are my comments in no particular order:

1. "Present case got enough pathogens by POCS," This is very confusing to read - where did pathogens come from?
2. Kindly avoid needless abbreviations such as "6 mo".