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Reviewer's report:

Summary:

The authors present the case of a 68 year old patient with a pancreatic hamartoma who underwent surgery after the tumor size increased within after 31 month.

Review:

The case summarizes an interesting finding in a patient with a pancreatic tumor. However, there is no real new aspect presented in the case here. The proceedings with pancreatic tumors are often difficult and as such there is no unambiguous way what to do, but the proposed strategy in this case is difficult to follow. The authors propose that the patient underwent surgery since the tumor progressed in size (42 x 39 mm at first diagnosis; after resection 40 x 40 mm), so this seems to be not the best argument. The option of a puncture of the tumor to support the final decision is not discussed. The summary of the formerly published cases in Table 2 is not very helpful.

Minor points:

The manuscript can be shortened. There is information in the manuscript that is not needed.

The conclusion in the abstract is difficult to understand.

The authors claim that surgical resection is still required for diagnosis. This is somehow true, but the sentence is misleading (I guess the meaning shall be that surgery is often needed to diagnose hamartomas).

The sentence about the allergic reaction after the CT is not useful.

Why did the patient get a CT, an MRI, and EUS at 21 months. I would assume that the CT is not really needed.

The descriptive part of the MRI findings (page 7) is hard to read and should be revised.

The histology that finally led to the diagnosis hamartoma should be described.
Some more information on hamartomas (cystic, solid, or both) might be integrated in the text.

The suggestion on page 12 line 24-31 is speculative and might be revised.

Are really more reports necessary to clarify the clinicopathological features of hamartomas (page 14, line 2-6)

What about other hamartomas (etc. periampullary)?

What does the review of the literature give us for a conclusion in the end?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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