

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_103854
Title of the Manuscript:	Omental Cysts A Rare Intra-Abdominal Pathology – Two Case Reports
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The paper discusses two cases of omental cysts diagnosed and successfully treated by surgery. Indeed, mesenteric and omental cysts are the rarest intra-abdominal pathologies. No more than 150 cases of omental cysts have been reported so far. Establishing the correct diagnosis in many cases is very tricky. In women, this tumour can be easily mistaken with ovarian cysts. Moreover, large cysts can simply mimic ascites. In fact, a correct preoperative diagnosis of omental cyst has been made in no more than 25% of the reported cases.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is well structured and comprehensive as well.</p> <p>4. The structure of the paper is appropriate.</p> <p>5. The paper is scientifically correct. Still, I have notice a discrepancy regarding the age of the child reported and this should be corrected. In abstract, the boy patient was 8 years old while in the detailed presentation was 14 years of age. In addition it would be much appreciated if the laboratory findings were presented in the paper. At least for the 32 years old female AFP, CA125, CEA, bHCG were very interesting and also important for a differential diagnosis.</p> <p>6. The references are clearly insufficient. If Pubmed is searched some interesting recent and comprehensive reports can be found.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English language used in this paper is acceptable for scientific community.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bogdan Ioan Stefanescu
Department, University & Country	“Dunarea De Jos” University of Galati, Romania