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Reviewer's report:

I think this case report is worth reporting since there have not been many papers about pancreatic hamartoma. The literature review is well done in this manuscript, although their discussion doesn't add much to what is already known. Some recommendations I should like to make are as below.

1. Who rendered the pathological diagnosis of pancreatic hamartoma? Usually, at least one pathologist is involved in every final diagnosis of tumor or tumor-like lesion. Moreover, pathological diagnosis is the main point at issue. However, no pathologist is included in this paper as a co-author. The authors should put the names of pathologists in the list of authors, unless the pathological diagnosis was made only by the surgeons in this case.

2. Citation order of the references is wrong, e.g. the reference #3 first appears after #4 (line 40-50, page 10).

3. Figure 4-b has two histological images. It is much easier for the readers to understand the authors' intention if they are separated into Figure 4-b and 4-c.

4. What made the lesion decrease in size 21 months after the initial visit and increase in size 7 months later? The authors' comment is "this type of chronological morphological change is likely one of the clinical features of pancreatic hamartoma". Are there any other specific considerations regarding this point?

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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