

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_98903
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidermoid cyst discovered during splenectomy: a case report and review of Literature
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.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Splenic cysts are a widely reported clinical condition in the literature. Would shorten: Splenic Epidermoid Cyst: A Case Report, for example. Abstract needs some minor editing. Abstract and structure appropriate. With a few minor edits for clarification. References sufficient and timely. Article needs some minor editing and correction of syntax and sentences for clarification.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is clear and sufficient, with minor editing recommended.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, information is presented, just needs some editing and clarification.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Randy Mccool
Department, University & Country	Northwest Community Hospital, USA