

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_98872
Title of the Manuscript:	Spontaneous intraperitoneal rupture of hydatid cysts of the liver with encapsulating peritonitis ; a case report
Type of the Article	Case report

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijmpcr.com/index.php/IJMPCR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Manuscript titled "Spontaneous intraperitoneal rupture of hydatid cysts of the liver with encapsulating peritonitis; a case report" show us interesting report of this complication which is very rare in the medical literature. Pictures are wonderful, and I total approve and support publication of this case report.  2. The title of the article is suitable.  3. Abstract of the article is comprehensive.  4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.  5. I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct.  6. The references sufficient and recent.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Josko Petricevic</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Mostar School of Medicine, Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>