

## 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>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>	1. Renal hydatid is rare and important disease hence the manuscript is important for scientific community. 2. I would suggest "Renal hydatid: Rare site of rare disease" 3. Abstract seems incomplete. Please include case history, investigations, management in short. 4. About manuscript - a. Detail history description needed – b. Being female patient – menstrual and obstetric history should be included. c. Area of residence is needed as disease is endemic in certain parts of the world. d. Clinical findings – Vital signs, Systemic examination, especially abdominal examination should be included. e. Radiological findings – Include films of CT scan and ultrasonography. f. Depict the results of renal function tests. 5. Manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. References are sufficient and recent.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language is suitable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Nil	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Swati Kurane
Department, University & Country	Bharati Vidyapeeth, University College of Nursing, India