

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_96807
Title of the Manuscript:	Renal Hydatid Cyst: A rarer site of infection
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://journalsajp.com/index.php/SAJP/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article is important to the scientific community and the title has been appropriately written. The abstract however is very abrupt and needs to be expanded to ensure that all the vital information has been included within this subsection.</p> <p>The individual sections would need to be reviewed whilst ensuring that an appropriate checklist has been utilised for this case report.</p> <p>Whilst the content of the manuscript is written largely satisfactorily, expansion is required in the individual subsections as aforementioned.</p> <p>The references are not complete and require revision with adherence to a particular format for referencing.</p> <p>The inclusion of histological images is useful and adds value to the overall article.</p> <p>Part of the data is incomplete on Page 2, could the authors ensure that this is reformatted to allow inclusion of all the information.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The sentences are rather short and abrupt in the message, it would be useful to expand this throughout the article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Whilst the topic is clinically useful and presents a unique case, there needs to be a revision in the areas highlighted above.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Debkumar Chowdhury
Department, University & Country	University of Glasgow, United Kingdom