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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Can you explain the abbreviation RI of 0,55 in page 4 line 31? Just a technical point: By what way, have you extracted the specimen? By a Pfannestiel way or another mini-laparotomy. Please precised it. Have you used an endobag in the extraction? If yes, than mention it.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This manuscript is a case report of a patient with Retrorectal mucinous adenocarcinoma arising from a tailgut cyst which was surgically resected. This case will likely be of interest to clinicians in the field as it is a rare condition. Furthermore, a literature review should be useful for clinicians to diagnose and treat it. However, I have major and minor issues with this manuscript as described below.  

Major 1. The discussion section seems redundant. I recommend the authors should focus on the diagnosis and treatment of adenocarcinoma in TGCs based on the literatures.  
2. Readers is likely to be interested in whether preoperative diagnosis of adenocarcinoma in TGCs is possible. Please provide detailed CT/MRI findings in each case, and discuss these findings.

Minor 1. (Core tip) Please explain MDT and TGCs.  
2. Chief complaints should be more summarized.  
3. Please provide findings of enhanced CT scan in the main text.  
4. The authors should describe TREATMENT section, followed by FINAL DIAGNOSIS.  
5. Please provide mapping of adenocarcinoma, using the cross-section image of resected specimen.  
3. The reason that the patients had received XELOX should be described in the OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP section.  
4. There were some cases who was received chemotherapy and/or radiotherapy in spite of complete resection. Please explain why these additional treatments were required.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This case report described a rare case of the tailgut cyst accompanying retrorectal mucinous adenocarcinoma. The content of the article is exciting and contributes to accumulating another case. However, there are some concerns about this article. 1. In Abstract, “Many doctors ~ “ is not scientific expression, so that they could say just rare case enough. 2. The authors state that the patient was not appropriately treated due to the COVID-19 epidemic. Did she infect SARS-Cov2? 3. In imaging examination, did they perform the enhanced MRI? Did they plan a PET examination to explore further metastasis? 4. XEROX is a brand name. Please use proper expression though out the article. 5. In Both discussion and conclusion, the authors denied a preoperative biopsy. However, in a cerein situation, it may be useful to diagnose for neoadjuvant treatment. These expressions are not suitable for this case report. The surgical approach mainly depends on the location of the tumor.6. The case presentation is too concise. 7. The number of references are small and not-up dated.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
TO authors: 1. No reference(s) for the whole INTRODUCTION section? 2. (Some patients have complications such as lower abdominal pain and perianal lesions, and many patients have no clinical symptoms. Due to the risk of complications, such as recurrent perianal suppuration). - Suggest to rephrase, “Patients may present with lower abdominal pain and…” (since it pertains to signs and symptoms; the complications follow after that) 3. Under Imaging examinations, what is RI (Spell out on first occurrence) 4. Choose which one format to use: 10*9 or 10x9 cm, and whether to use cm or mm; and use the same format all throughout the manuscript 5. Under treatment, please confirm “laparoscopic laparotomy”; conflicting terms 6. Who performed the procedure? Specialty, experience 7. Include in discussion, application of minimally invasive surgery as an approach to treat TGCs. 8. Discuss previous literature about outcomes following XELOX therapy, recurrence rate/relapse, OS; Discuss risk factors for malignant transformation 9. What is the ideal resection margin for TGCs suspected or preoperatively diagnosed with malignant component?
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The authors have answered reviewer's comments and revised the article well.