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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a case report by Dr. Xun Yang et al. entitled "Complete excision of esophageal bronchogenic cyst by endoscopic submucosal tunnel dissection: A case report". The authors present their experience by using ESTD for endoscopically treating a patient with intramural esophageal bronchogenic cyst. The authors postulate that it is the first case reported achieving radical excision using ESTD for treating such cyst. According to the authors a previously reported case treated with ESTD by Tang Xiaowei et al. Endoscopy 2014; 46: E626-E627 was not radically excised.

**Major points:**
As the patient was asymptomatic and there was no definite diagnosis of the lesion why did the authors proceeded to ESTD as the cyst could be of another more benign nature? ESTD is an interventional approach that harbors possible complications compared to follow up that is more benign. How the authors address this question?

**Minor points:**
I suggest that the authors should mention and comment on the fact that the differential diagnosis between esophageal bronchogenic versus duplication cyst can be challenging before having access to the pathology report.

EUS FNA can be an alternative in adding at the diagnosis of the cystic lesion but it includes risk of infection etc. On the other hand, duplication cysts can only be followed up if they are asymptomatic. Could the authors comment why they have not performed EUS FNA and analysis of the cystic fluid before performing ESTD?

Fig 2. It would be more representative to include EUS with doppler to show that there is no flow and the lesion represents a cyst. To my opinion the lesion is anechoic and not hypoechoic as the authors refer to and I suggest that the proper word will be used.

Fig 4. B. The Fig referred to the dissociation of the cyst is not representative. Can the authors replace it with a better one?
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