

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Please see the attached file below.

Author did a good job in writing the manuscript and the topic is interesting and quite uncommon. However, several corrections need to be made which are as follows:

1. In the Abstract section, no need for the subtitle, " Core tip."

→ I appreciate your comments. We delete the core tip in the abstract.

2. In the Introduction section, please revise the sentence, " A tongue location is rare", because tongue is the most common site of the intraoral lesions.

→ I corrected the sentence like this. "Although several reports have been issued on this topic of intraoral schwannoma in young patients, no review has been published on pediatric schwannoma of the tongue."

3. Are you sure you included all reported cases from 1956-2020, because I found a couple of cases which are not mentioned in your table like the one from 2014 by Bhola et al in Case reports in dentistry and other one by Amer et al from 2018 in Case reports in pathology.

→ Thank you for your comments. I added the 3 cases in the reference of Bhola et al case. Furthermore, the Amer et al's case was excluded because it is not solitary schwannoma, but the plexiform schwannoma of the tongue with Neurofibromatosis Type 2.

4. In the Case presentation section, please compile all the information into one paragraph.

→ I compiled all the information into one paragraph in the Case presentation section.

5. In the Discussion section, please also mention the peak incidence in age for tongue

schwannomas.

→ I mentioned the peak incidence in age for tongue schwannomas in the page 5 in the Discussion.

6. In Table 1, please mention the missing cases till 2020(two of them I mentioned above).

→ I added the three missing cases in the reference of Bhola et al case. Furthermore, I excluded the Amer et al's case because it is Plexiform Schwannoma of the Tongue with Neurofibromatosis Type 2.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear Author, Your present case report named "Pediatric schwannoma of the tongue: A case report and review of literature" was read and assessed carefully. After evaluation, the author should revise as follow;

1. The author should add the operation features (anesthesia, operation technique

→ I mentioned in case presentation in the page 3.

He underwent **transoral mass excision** **under general anesthesia**

2. When the patient was discharged after operation? was there any complication?

→ I mentioned in case presentation in the page 4.

The patient was discharged from the hospital **without complications** **at postoperative two days**

3. Is there any preoperatively imaging figure such as CT or MRI? Is there any specific radiologic imaging for Schwannoma in CT/MRI?

→ Unfortunately, the patient's parents was refused the CT/MR work up due to the medical co

st.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The case report described a tongue schwannoma in an 8-year boy. The symptoms, diagnostic modalities, surgical procedure, pathologic description, and follow-up data for the tongue schwannoma was well presented. The differential diagnoses and intraoperative tips were also discussed. However, many previous case reports have described the disease. The novelty is low. The significance to clinical practice is doubted due to the lack of preoperative diagnosis modality. Surgical resection is the first choice for tongue masses whatever the final pathological diagnosis is. Overall, this was a good rare case for the readers of this journal.

→ I appreciate your valuable comments.