

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_105862
Title of the Manuscript:	Primary Mesenteric Hydatid cyst- A Rare Case report
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.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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Unquestionably, its importance lies in the treatment of a rare pathology, which can provide an effective therapeutic method.</b></p> <p><b>The title is appropriate.</b></p> <p><b>The Summary is explanatory and introduces the case in question in a didactic way.</b></p> <p><b>The structure is adequate for a case report.</b></p> <p><b>Except for details of the writing of the text (see comments in the revised document), the work is scientifically well focused. Good quality photos stand out. It is suggested that the table is not a photo and complies with the norm for the case.</b></p> <p><b>Because the case is rare, few bibliographies exist. However, 4 references that are not found in the text are shown in the bibliographical relationship (see revised document).</b></p> <p><b>In our opinion, the work is well prepared and meets the scientific requirements for publication. The details indicated in the comments should be rectified.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>English is well used.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The work is of quality and may arouse interest in those who consult the magazine.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Luis Remedios Hernández</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cuba</b>