

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Excellent and interesting case of quite a rare disease. Excellent review of epidermoid cysts, and the uniqueness of this case is one of this manuscript's strengths. There are minor grammatical errors, for instance: 1) Abstract Case Summary: "although imaging examination indicated that the mass probably originated from the pancreas, and it was considered a solid pseudopapillary tumor of the pancreas (SPTP), the surgery revealed...". Consider changing to : "Because imaging indicated that the mass probably originated from the pancreas, it was considered a solid pseudopapillary tumor of the pancreas (SPTP). However, the surgery revealed..."

The sentence has been revised according your suggestion.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors have successfully described an interesting case of Retroperitoneal Congenital Epidermoid Cyst misdiagnosed as a Solid Pseudopapillary Tumor of the pancreas. Overall, the case report is well written, but is in need of some grammatical and language polishing.

Grammatical and language polishing has been performed by language editing services

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Comments to the authors The article with the title “retroperitoneal congenital epidermoid cyst misdiagnosed as a solid pseudopapillary tumor of the pancreas: a case report” is in generally well done, but I would offer these comments to the investigators: 1) Several words throughout the manuscript appear to be merged. Please correct it. 2) Some grammatical errors occur. The manuscript contains significant language-related issues. Please correct these types of grammatical errors throughout the paper. 3) Introduction: “Retroperitoneal epidermoid cysts are a rare disease....” Please add the

incidence in the general population. "Rare disease" is not enough. 4) The reference list is quite old. Authors should focus on recent papers and papers older than three years should except for an overriding purpose 5) The authors mentioned that "Postoperative pathology showed an epidermoid cyst with infection". Please explain what kind of bacteria was detected". Did this infection affect the postoperative patient's course?

1. Part of merged-words have been corrected.

2. Grammatical and language polishing has been performed by language editing services

3. "Retroperitoneal epidermoid cysts are a rare disease...." has already changed to "The incidence of retroperitoneal epidermoid cysts are less than 1/40000".

4. The references has already been renewed.

5. No bacteria were found in the specimen according to discussing with pathologist,there was some inflammatory reaction around specimen,and the pathological report could mix the inflammatory with infection.I am sorry about it.Therefore, "Postoperative pathology showed an epidermoid cyst with infection" consider changing to "Postoperative pathology showed an epidermoid cyst".

1) Science editor:

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

The manuscript elaborated a case of Retroperitoneal Congenital Epidermoid Cyst misdiagnosed as a Solid Pseudopapillary Tumor of the pancreas. It seems the case was in a rare situation and therefore, can be considered for further review in this journal, however, there are several concerns to be clarified prior to the further review. 1. The article needs a great deal of language polishing, also, please avoid long sentences. 2. The choice of the references is outdated.

1. Grammatical and language polishing has been performed by language editing services.

2. The references has already been renewed.