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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments: Thanks for sharing such an interesting case, but I have some questions:
1. The authors mentioned that "the mass was also adhered to the pancreas," and there are several reports that peri-pancreatic lymphangioma was "diagnosed by endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)-fine-needle aspiration (FNA) cytology" (such as DOI: 10.17235/reed.2020.7671/2020). Thus it is necessary to clarify whether the EUS procedure was done before excision (it would help determine whether the enlarged cyst was benign or malignant) and why not.
2. The author also mentioned that "aspiration revealed a light-yellowish turbid fluid." Did the patient have a suspicious history of pancreatitis, and was there any test result suggesting infection when the cyst enlarged? After Laparotomy, was the cyst fluid tested for amylase and lipase?
3. Advances in EUS-guided diagnostics (including cyst fluid molecular analysis, EUS-guided needle-based confocal laser endomicroscopy, and EUS-guided needle microforceps biopsy) have increased the accuracy of differentiating peri-pancreatic cystic lesions. It is suggested to supplement the differential diagnoses of lymphangioma in the discussion section.
4. There are still some spelling and article usage issues in this manuscript that need to be carefully checked and revised, such as in "The postoperative period was uneventful except for paralytic ileus, and the patient was discharged on post-operative day (POD) 15 with satisfactory relief from previous symptoms."
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Lymphangiomas are benign tumors commonly found in children, adult cases are extremely rare, especially for the huge mess. Because the tumor is cystic space occupying it is not difficult to resect the tumor. However surgical decompression will alleviate the symptoms of compression in patients. Therefore it is suggested to point out in the conclusion that the tumor is benign and grows slowly so it can be continued to be observed before compression symptoms appear.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thanks to the authors for their answers, although I have different opinions on the 1st and 3rd questions.