Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 35852

Response to Reviewer comments

We thank all reviewers for their constructive comments to our manuscript. In light of these helpful comments, we have revised the paper. We outline below our detailed responses to the reviewers. We hope that the new version of the paper and our answers to the reviewers have clarified the confusing points.

Reviewer 1: 02822478

R1-1. Kim et al have described a case report of mucinous adenocarcinoma of the duodenum with a pericholedochal lymph node metastasis showing cystic degeneration mistaken for a choledochal cyst. The findings are not novel however, the manuscript is well-written with good images. I would suggest deletion of the comment '...even with the retrospective review by a board-certified abdominal radiologist with 9 years of clinical experience.'

Answer) Thank you for your comment. As your suggestion, we deleted the comment ‘even with the retrospective review by a board-certified abdominal radiologist with 9 years of clinical experience’ in the discussion section.

Reviewer 2: 02537509

R2-1. Authors reported a interesting case of mucinous ADC of the duodenum. The approach in the description is correct. I think that this case report is worth publishing in the WJG.

Reviewer 3: 03316969

R3-1. Dear Editor, Kim et al presented a case report titled as "Cystic Metastasis from a Mucinous Adenocarcinoma of Duodenum Mimicking Type II Choledochal Cyst: A Case Report''. The findings are not completely new but are interesting and I believe add some contribution to the literature. The manuscript is well prepared and written however the pictures should be better described. The language is very smooth. It is valuable manuscript especially for young surgeons and oncologists.

Answer) Thank you for your comment. As you have pointed out, we revised the figure legends as appropriate.