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These are interesting cases of benign pancreatic hamartomas being diagnosed after surgical resection.

The paper nicely reviews the imaging characteristics of each of these lesions in each patient. I think the concept is good, as more descriptions of these lesions in the literature are needed to prevent unnecessary surgery as occurred in these patients.

However:

1. Many of the imaging descriptive terms are not worded correctly, such as "blood echoes" and "uneven internal density" and "boundary was clear after enhancement" to name a few. Instead, it should be "borders were well-defined after enhancement" and "heterogenous internal content" for example.

2. The language of the paper needs quite a bit of editing prior to publication. There are many grammatical mistakes throughout.

3. The abstract needs to be rewritten to accurately reflect the conclusion of the paper - currently the conclusion states that "the diagnosis of pancreatic hamartoma should be considered", but in actuality the conclusion is that detailed review of multiple imaging modalities may help in diagnosis of PH and prevent unnecessary surgery for patients with this diagnosis.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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