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### Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript

- [ ] Grade A: Excellent
- [ Y] Grade B: Good
- [ ] Grade C: Fair
- [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance

### Language quality

- [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing
- [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing
- [ Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing
- [ ] Grade D: Rejection

### Conclusion

- [ ] Accept (High priority)
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### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- Abstract should be concise
- The term “mucus epidermoid carcinoma” should be replaced by mucoepidermoid carcinoma. Language and grammar revision is essential.
- Introduction section doesn’t contain any cited source?! Also lacking important information introducing the case and its importance to be reported.
- D dimer test is not properly typed.
- I wonder if you asked for any tumor markers?
- In discussion, you should discuss the different rare tumors came with unusual presentations; examples should be provided: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eucr.2020.101367 & https://doi.org/10.7497%2Fj.issn.2095-3941.2014.03.007
- You should discuss the mucoepidermoid carcinoma in salivary gland and in lung, is there any morphologic or genetic relations.