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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This is a case report of inflammatory myoglandular polyp (IMGP) of the cecum. A quality of endoscopic and microscopic photographs is too poor to diagnose. And this report has some serious concerns.

Major

1. In abstract, authors described that IMGPs must be considered different from other nonneoplastic polyps of the large bowel. What kinds of nonneoplastic polyps of the large bowel? Inflammatory fibroid polyps or juvenile polyps etc?
2. Endoscopic view should be changed. A higher quality one. It is unclear whether this polyp is pedunculated and has partially ulcerated surface or not.
3. Histological findings of IFP (inflammatory fibroid polyp) and IMGP are different. If authors claim that histological diagnosis of biopsy specimen is IFP, authors should show histological feature of the biopsy specimen.
4. Why did authors think that anemia of this patient was due to this polyp? This polyp did not reveal evident bleeding.
5. Which is the cause of anemia, autoimmune haemolytic anemia or this polyp?
6. Histological findings (figure 3) should be changed. A higher quality one which reveals 1) inflammatory granulation tissue in the lamina propria; 2) proliferation of smooth muscle from the muscularis mucosae; 3) hyperplastic glands with occasional cystic dilatation.
7. Authors described that IMGP must be differentiated from other non-neoplastic polyps such as inflammatory cap polyps (ICP), inflammatory cloacogenic polyps, polyps secondary to mucosal prolapse syndrome (MPS) and polypoid prolapsing mucosal folds of diverticular disease in discussion. Don’t you think IMGP must be differentiated from IFP?
8. In your institute, the large polyp (over 4cm?) is recommended to resect by surgery? You could resect this polyp by endoscopic resection (including piecemeal resection) because the biopsy specimen was diagnosed benign and endoscopic findings did not reveal malignant findings. Couldn’t you avoid surgery?

Minor
1 It must be considered different from other non-neoplastic polyps for its clinical and hystopathological features. It must be considered different from other non-neoplastic polyps for its clinical and histopathological features.

2 Figure legends. In figure 2, authors should describe about IMGP feature.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests' below