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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a well written, circumstantial manuscript regarding a relatively rare tumor. The special characteristics in this case report is the patient's age, the particular type of myoepithelioma along with the location of the tumor. Interesting are the general immunohistochemical details provided for the tumor's profile.

In the Introduction section the authors state the rarity of the lesion, a feature on which the speciality of the case is partially depended on and which is not clearly documented. This is why I believe that the paper would benefit from a table delineating reported cases of palatal myoepitheliomas (or specifically palatal plasmacytoid myoepitheliomas) focusing on patient's age, gender, treatment, follow up, recurrence etc.

In the Introduction section, 2nd line along with the year of first report of the lesion the name of the scientist should be stressed.

In the Discussion section, 4th to 7th lines the authors declare the higher aggressiveness of myoepitheliomas comparing to pleomorphic adenomas. Though, the reference (10) points to an article which does not contain data supporting this.

In the discussion section, a differential diagnosis from malignant myoepithelioma is provided. Besides the reported features there are further such as fibrosis-hyalinization and interstitial hemorrhage (which in the present case could set a doubt since they are prominent as seen in some of the pictures given). To enhance the accuracy of the data it should be added the role of Ki-67 label index and how it helps in the differential diagnosis. For instance, the paper: 'Ferri E, Pavon I, Armato E, et al. Myoepithelioma of a minor salivary gland of the cheek: case report. Acta Otorhinolaryngol Ital. 2006;26:43–6.' which is contained in the reference list may help.

Since the authors conducted a CT it would be interesting to provide a paragraph in the discussion section, focusing on radiology of the lesion with current references.

References are not written according to the journal's requirements.

The figures' legends are too long. There is no need for such detailed description of the figures since they are described at the respective point of the paper.
Minor typing errors:

*In the Case report section, 2nd paragraph, line 9 the sentence 'Immunohistochemically, the cytoplasm of the plasmacytoid cells were positive for S-100 protein; should be tranformed to 'Immunohistochemically, the cytoplasm of the plasmacytoid cells was positive for S-100 protein'.

*In the Discussion section, 2nd line the sentence 'These tumors can occur at any age but is most common in young adults between the ages of 30 and 50' should be transformed to 'These tumors can occur at any age but are most common in young adults between the ages of 30 and 50'.

*In the Discussion section, 3rd paragraph, 1st line the word also should be between commas. The same applies to all 'also' words found through the paper.

*In the Discussion section, 6th paragraph, 7th line the word 'but' should me omitted.

*In the Discussion section, 7th paragraph, 4th line, 'myogenic markers #SMA' should be tranformed to 'myogenic markers such as #SMA'.
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