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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?: No

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?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

General Comments:
This manuscript comprises a presentation of five new cases of minor salivary gland mucoepidermoid carcinomas in pediatric and adolescent patients, accompanied by a review of the pertinent literature. Overall, the presented cases are well documented with sufficient epidemiologic, clinical and histologic data for each individual case. In addition, the review of the literature is thorough and provides a broader understanding of the salient features of this rare malignancy in childhood and adolescence. In my opinion, the subject’s clinical relevance and the manuscript’s overall quality justify a recommendation for publication.

Revisions necessary for publication:
1) Although the described cases have been adequately described, it would be
helpful to include representative clinical and histological images for individual cases.

2) The abstract section is divided into 3 parts: Introduction, Case Presentation and Conclusions. In contrast, the text is divided into: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion. In other words, the manuscript was written following a study format but this is not reflected on the Abstract format. This discrepancy should be corrected.

3) In the abstract, the authors could emphasize the fact that there were not cases of metastases or death due to the disease.

4) In the materials and methods, the method used for the literature search could be described.

5) In the second paragraph of the materials and methods section, the authors state that they did not include some studies based on the lack of specific information on individual cases. Although their rationale is acceptable, they could still include these studies as references for those readers who may want to further study this subject.

6) In the results, a graph showing distribution of cases according to anatomic location would be a useful addition.

7) In the results, the authors could mention which imaging modalities were used to determine tumor extension and bone involvement. This subject could be also included in the discussion with regards to the most appropriate diagnostic imaging investigation for such cases.

8) The age range of patients included in this study was from birth to nineteen years of life. Considering that other studies in pediatric and adolescent patients prefer to use a range from 0 to 16 or 18 years, the authors should state and justify their decision to use a broader age range (especially taking into account that a case of a 19 year old patient has been included).

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