


Review 1: The authors presented two cases of ghost cell odontogenic carcinoma. In general well written manuscript . The cases presentetions are very clear. I have a few minor comments and recomendations to improve the manuscript: (1) introduction „...is an extremely rare odontogenic epithelial... „; (2) case 1 Teeth „11-12....“ ; (3) add the patient's ortopantomographic radiograph on follow up (case 1); (4) case 2 add the data about duration of painful swelling; (5) in discussion section the authors wrote: „booth patients had impacted tooth“ – add those data in patient descriptions/presentations and figure legend for patient 2; (5) The figure 1 and figure 3 are too small. I suggest presenting orthopantomographic radiograph and CBCT image as separate figures.

Response: (1)(2)We have added 'odontogenic' and 'teeth' in corresponding position. (3)In addition, the patient in case 1 was reviewed in local hospital, we contact him by telephone follow-up. So the postoperative image can not acquire. (4)The duration time of painful swelling in case 2 had been added. (5)And the images of tumor with impacted teeth which have been pointed with an arrow have been added. (6)Finally, we have provided the orthopantomographic radiograph and CBCT image as separate figures.



Review 5: The current manuscript reported on two uncommon cases of ghost cell odontogenic carcinoma respectively occurred in maxilla and mandible and with literature review. The following point are suggested for further consideration. 1. The diganosis of ghost cell odontogenic carcinoma heavily depends on histopathological evaluation; however, the authors lack to supply a fully description of the histopathological finding of the two cases. To my opinion, it needs to be added. 2. In the discussion section, the authors have provided the findings of immunohistochemical evaulation of ghost cell odontogenic carcinoma. However, no immunohistocemical evaluaion has been supplied in the two cases. It needs to be included.

Response: We have added the fully description of the histopathological findings of the two cases in case report part respectively. In addition, we have provided the corresponding description of the IHC findings of the two cases in discussion section.