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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The authors describe an unusual case of a pancreatic hamartoma. I have some suggestions to further improve this manuscript prior to acceptance.

1. The conclusion on the abstract needs to be reworded instead of simply listing descriptive phrases for pancreatic hamartoma.

2. Is this really true that cystic neoplasms of the pancreas are that rare. My impression is that cystic neoplasms are more common that once thought and may be underdiagnosed.

3. The included figures help augment the paper well.

4. Overall, while this is an interesting case, I think the authors need to better portray the conclusion - I don't think identifying descriptive phrases for pancreatic hamartoma is sufficient for the conclusions. The authors need to emphasize what is novel about this case, what are the key clinical take away points, why this is important to recognize, etc. The paper is well written, but the conclusion I think is severely lacking.

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

Yes

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.

Yes

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:
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