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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | Papillary cystadenomas are benign tumors treated with simple excision. However, they can be histological mimickers of metastatic renal cell carcinomas. Therefore, clinical, radiological and histological analysis of cases is essential for good outcomes. The manuscript covers major aspects of this disease but can be made more robust and more important for the scientific community by adding parameters mentioned in optional/general comments. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title is suitable. |  |
| **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.** | It is better to limit the abstract to the case. There’s no need to mention other benign and malignant tumors in abstract. Also, the last line may be improved grammatically. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript is scientifically correct. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are sufficient but most of them are not recent. Especially the references about incidence of this tumor should be recent. |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The language is not confusing but can be grammatically improved at various places. |  |
| **Optional/General** comments | It would be better if an image of the ultrasound scan is provided. There is no mention of the tumor’s gross appearance.If a follow up was taken, the case report can be made more robust by adding it. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **PART 2:**  |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |

**Reviewer details:**

**Simran Ailani, Mahatma Gandhi Medical Colllege & Hospital, India**