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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

RELEVANCE - Does this case report make a contribution to medical knowledge, have educational value, or highlight the need for a change in clinical practice or diagnostic/prognostic approaches?

No, the findings of this report are well known and/or similar reports have already been published

CASE DESCRIPTION - Are the details of the case sufficiently well described to understand the patient's symptoms and course of treatment?

No - there are minor issues

DIAGNOSIS/INTERPRETATION - Based on the facts presented, are the diagnosis, interpretation, and course of treatment medically sound?

Yes, the work described is medically sound

DISCUSSION OF THE CASE - Does the discussion appropriately analyse the importance of the findings and their relevance to future understanding of disease processes, diagnosis or treatment? Has an adequate literature review pertinent to the case been included?

Yes, the case is discussed fully in the context of the literature

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:
GENERAL COMMENTS: Overall, the case report is written nicely. However the Background section of the manuscript is written in brief. Although the facts of the report are well known and are reported in the literature earlier, the authors have outlined the novelty of the case well.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The title of the case report must be rephrased. The authors have not only reviewed the surgical options, while they have reviewed the nasolabial cysts per se.

In the abstract section, the conclusion seems to be inappropriate as far as the manuscript is concerned. The authors have written that "Surgical enucleation is generally described as the treatment of choice for nasolabial cysts, since it allows histological examination, proving both diagnostic and curative. Furthermore, excluding complete surgical excision and endoscopic marsupialization, all other modalities are associated with a high recurrence rate".

This conclusion seems to be as if a meta analysis on treatment plans of nasolabial cysts was done. However, the methodology of the paper highlights it to be purely a case report with the discussion of the findings with the literature. So, please write the conclusion in resonance to the methodology and title.

Key words are missing after the abstract.

In the case presentation section of the report, the authors have not elaborated upon the intraoral findings. Was there obliteration of vestibule? Status of dentition and teeth in the concerned region is not mentioned. History of trauma or any other history is not mentioned. All these facts are important while making a clinical diagnosis of such lesions.

The authors have even not described the palpatory findings of the swelling in detail. Only mild tenderness on palpation is mentioned, which is insufficient. Even inspectory findings like colour of swelling, anatomical extent, shape, etc. are not described.

What was the authors’ impression about the diagnosis before prescribing CT scan? Please mention this in clinical diagnosis or differential diagnosis.

Even surgical treatment is mentioned very casually. Further, there is no mention about the histopathology report in the case presentation.

Further, was any radiological examination done postoperatively? Why was MRI not considered?

Please add more recent references.

In the figures, please provide histological slide pictures.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
The introduction section is written in brief. It should be more detailed.

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

No

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

Yes

**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:

Acceptable
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