

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_105406
Title of the Manuscript:	Primary Hydatid Cyst Of The Breast And Mini Review
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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The article presents a rare case of atypical location of the hydatid cyst, encountered with an extremely low frequency, especially useful for young specialists who will be notified about this situation.</p> <p>The title is well chosen, being the clear mirror of the article.</p> <p>The abstract is well designed, creating a theme on the issue and presenting the clinical case synthetically.</p> <p>The article is well founded for a clinical case presentation, with sufficient clinical data, supported by an eloquent imaging; it also contains a mini-review on the issue, emphasizing the rarity of this location.</p> <p>The article is certainly scientifically correct, supported by convincing imaging and representative bibliographic citations.</p> <p>The 10 bibliographic indexes selected are current and well inserted in the article.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English used is correct, keywords are chosen correctly.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Cirimbei Ciprian
Department, University & Country	University of Medicine and Pharmacy Carol Davila, Romania

can