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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor

We got professional help, and the quality of the English had been improved. All changes in our revising the manuscript were highlighted. Thank you.

Reviewer's report
Title: A case report of paraesophageal bronchogenic cyst with esophageal communication
Version: 3 Date: 7 May 2012
Reviewer: Zhengcai Liu
Reviewer's report:
(1) Major Compulsory Revision
The case report is well documented and organized, and there’s no major compulsory revision from me.
(2) Minor Essential Revisions
There’re some language mistakes in the manuscript. For example, in line 7, page 2, “communicate” should be changed into “communicating.” In line 7, page 2, “lesions of congenital” should be changed into “congenital lesions.” In line 19, page 3, “para-esophageal” should be changed into “para-esophageal.” This article can be accepted after these minor revisions.
Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests

We corrected those grammar errors and spelling errors. Thank you.

Reviewer's report
Title: A case report of paraesophageal bronchogenic cyst with esophageal communication
Version: 3 Date: 3 May 2012
Reviewer: qingq Liu
Reviewer's report:
Discretionary Revisions
This paper is relevant and the content of this manuscript is very interesting.
However, the manuscript has some spelling and wording errors.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests

We corrected those spelling errors and wording errors. Thank you.

Reviewer's report
Title: A case report of paraesophageal bronchogenic cyst with esophageal
communication
Version: 3 Date: 22 April 2012
Reviewer: ting wang
Reviewer's report:
This paper is relevant and the subject is very interesting and suitable published.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests

Thank you.

Reviewer's report
Title: A case report of paraesophageal bronchogenic cyst with esophageal communication
Version: 3 Date: 25 April 2012
Reviewer: thomasa ni
Reviewer's report:
The authors have described a rare and interesting foregut-derived anomaly, which was called as ‘the lumen-communicated pare-esophageal bronchogenic cyst’. They emphasized that the rare anomaly should be differentiated from a fistula between a mediastinal cyst and esophagus due to inflammatory invasion, with more simple surgical procedure. It was well written, and worthy for readers. However, there are some things need minor revision. I suggest a review of the following items:
1. However, not an intact inner face of canal confirmed in Knezevi# J's study and our case research. Please confirm your description, intact face or not an intact face?
2. Full-layer suture of the neck of canal along esophageal wall in two layers was enough for a safe repairment. You sutured two layers?
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests

1. The sentence “However, not an intact inner face of canal confirmed in...” should be replaced by “However, there is an intact inner face of canal confirmed in...”

2. Full-layer suture of the neck of canal along esophageal wall in two layers was enough for a safe repairment. “two layers” should be replaced by the word “twice”

Thank you.