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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: None

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: No

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?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

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:

I commend the authors on looking at a rare group of lesions in pediatric age group over a long period of time (35 years).

This paper is not very coherant and needs major editing.

In the abstract instead of clubbing the findings from literature the findings in your series needs to be highlighted.

When describing mean eg age then the range followed by mean needs to be done.

First the results in your series needs to be reported and then compared to the the reports in the literature.

There doesnt seem to be anything novel in the findings from your series.
Any risk factors (e.g., bone involvement, margins, size of lesions) predicted recurrences? This will add more value to the paper.

Majority of the paper should be describing your series and what important findings you are contributing to the literature and then should be compared to the rest of the literature.

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