

## Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp-21-32>

### Reviewer Comments

**Comment 1:** Recommendation for The Title: Please remove the word 'newborn' from the title

**Reply 1:** We are very sorry for our negligence of misunderstanding of 'congenital'. We have removed the 'in a newborn' from the title and changed to 'Multiple congenital granular cell tumours of the maxilla and mandible: a rare case report and review of the literature'.

Changes in the text: Page1, Line2.

**Comment 2:** Recommendation for Abstract: The English used in the abstract should be improved and please re-write the conclusion.

**Reply 2:** We have made correction and re-written conclusion part according to the Reviewer's suggestion.

Changes in the text: Page2, Line34/44 and Page3, Line45/50.

**Comment 3:** Recommendation for keyword: please provide appropriate keywords. Suggestion: addmaxilla and mandible.

**Reply 3:** We appreciate your drawing our attention to itand add keywords of maxilla, mandible and paediatrics

Changes in the text: Page3, Line51

**Comment 4:** Recommendation for background: There is room for improving the introduction. Since the aim is to report on multiple CGCT and treatment modalities used, the author should at least highlight briefly the frequency of occurrence of multiple lesions, associated symptoms, diagnostic methods and the suggested treatment modalities.

**Reply 4:** We made some changes in the manuscript including adding the frequency of occurrence, associated symptoms and treatment modalities of the CGCT and modifying grammatical errors.

Changes in the text: Page3, Line53/54, 58/63, 66/70.

**Comment 5:** Recommendation for Case Report: Please improve the grammar. The case report requires some modification.

**Reply 5:** It is really true as Reviewer suggested that significant violation of grammarthroughout the case report. We tried our best to improvethe grammar and made correction in the entire Case presentation. For the 'normal breeding was difficult', we corrected it into 'breastfeeding was difficult' (see Page4, Line82). Then we removed the

phrases 'according to classical features' and give a diagnosis directly (see Page4, Line84). About the Line 78/79, we rephrased the sentence to state clearly the two mass with different treatment (see Page4, Line85/86. Additionally, we removed the relevant past intervention (see Page4, line87). Although supplemented the pregnancy history and mother's medical history (see Page4, line 75/77), we still didn't retrospect the reason for caesarean section. Last we added the histological findings (see Page5, Line92/98). Changes in the text: Page4, Line75/77,82, 85/86; Page5, Line92/98.

**Comment 6:** Recommendation for Discussion: The discussion needs improvement. Please rewrite the discussion basing on your case and accompany a relevant literature review.

**Reply 6:** We have re-written this part according to the Reviewer's suggestion. In the discussion, we added some subheadings to make it clearer and more logical.

Changes in the text: Page5/10 Discussion and review of the literature.

**Comment 7:** Recommendation for Conclusion: Please include the conclusion

**Reply 7:** We have added the conclusion at the end of the article.

Changes in the text: Page10 Conclusion, Line203/211.

**Comment 8:** Recommendation for Structure and length: Please reorganize the article especially the introduction and discussion section

**Reply 8:** We appreciate that you draw our attention to it. We reorganized the article, removed the lengthy sentence and added some subheadings especially the discussion sections.

Changes in the text: see in manuscript.

**Comment 9:** Recommendation for Logic: restructure the manuscript for clarity

**Reply 9:** We tried our best to improve grammars and clarity and made some changes in the thorough manuscript to make it more logical.

Changes in the text: see in manuscript.

**Comment 10:** Recommendation for Figures: please provide better clinical images of the patient if possible.

**Reply 10:** We are very sorry for our figures especially figure 1. Due to the shooting equipment and non-cooperation of the neonate, we could not capture more or clearer clinical images. We wish you could understand this limitation.

**Comment 11:** Recommendation for English: the authors are requested to seek help from an expert in the English language in their locality.

**Reply 11:** We submitted our manuscript to a professional language editing service

(Elsevier). The manuscript was thoroughly edited using British English without changing our original intentions. The language editing certificate will be attached with the revised manuscript.