

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_98038
Title of the Manuscript:	Hydatid Cyst of the Lesser Sac: a case report and literature review
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. 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>	The paper titled "Hydatid Cyst of the Lesser Sac: a case report and literature review" is relevant, interesting and meets the standards and conditions to be published in Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science. The paper is well written, the text is clear and easy to read. There is no need for corrections in the text. <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper is well written, the text is clear and easy to read. The introduction presents the basic characteristics and specifics of the disease that is the subject of diagnostic investigation. The presentation of the case is good, the findings from the diagnostic examinations and the patohistological finding are presented. The paper is interesting and will be useful to colleagues in their practice.	

### 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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Antonio Gligorievski</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University "Goce Delcev", University Clinic of Surgical Diseases "St. Naum Ohridski", North Macedonia</b>