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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Comments
An interesting case, in genera, images would make it appropriate for publication.

Abstract:
1. Line 1: “involving the” should be replaced by “of the”
2. Line 4: “and” should be omitted

Section introduction:
1. Line 4: “lineage. They are the most common lymphomas involving the salivary glands in a recent report [1].” Should be rephrased into “lineage and are the commonest involving the salivary glands [1].”
2. Line 5: “autoimmune diseases or inflammatory” diseases should be omitted
3. Line 8: “MALT lymphomas have also been reported to occur in the salivary
 glands, lung, skin, soft tissues, breast, thyroid gland, thymus, and ocular adnexa
 and Orbit [5].” This phrase offers nothing to this section and should be omitted.

4. Line 9: This is not a study, it is a case report. Please rephrase.

5. Line 10: “lymphoma and appearing” “and should be deleted

6. Line 10: “parotid gland and a brief review of the literature” should be rephrased
 into “parotid gland.” There is no actual review of the literature. There are only
 extensive references to several authors.

Section case report:

1. Case report should be changed into case presentation

2. The whole section surgical anatomy (Line 1 to 16 of this section) should be
 deleted. It offers nothing to the manuscript and reduces its quality.

3. The origin of the patient should be added, according to the guidelines of the
 journal.

4. “A firm mobile mass was present in the left parotid gland. Examination revealed
 a 5 cm diameter mass in the superficial lobe of the left parotid.” Should be
 rephrased into “Examination revealed a 5cm firm mobile mass in the superficial
 lobe of the left parotid.”

5. “tested by ELISA” should be deleted.

6. Several images should be added to the manuscript illustrating: 1. the operative
 field, 2. the echo of the tumor, 3. the spiral CT of the gland (before and after the
 operation) 4. the pathology findings of the specimen.
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