

**ReviewForm3**

JournalName:	<a href="#">InternationalJournalofMedicalandPharmaceuticalCaseReports</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJMPCR_125800
Titleof theManuscript:	preoperativelymanifestationsasunivesicularmasslikelesionandpostoperativelyasmultivesicularlesionwithmultipledaughtercyst:averyrarecasereport
Typeof the Article	Casereport

**PART1: ReviewComments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISIONcomments	<b>Reviewer'scomment</b>	<b>Author'sFeedback</b> (Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpartinthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedbackhere)
<b>Pleasewriteafew sentencesregardingtheimportance ofthismanuscriptforthescientificcommunity.Whydo youlike(ordislike)thismanuscript?Aminimumof3-4 sentencesmayberequiredforthispart.</b>	This manuscript presents a rare case of pulmonary univesicular hydatid cysts transforming into multivesicular lesions postoperatively, highlighting the complexities of diagnosing and managing hydatid disease. Its significance lies in the detailed exploration of an unusual presentation, which could enhance awareness among clinicians about potential atypical manifestations of this disease. The thorough discussion of diagnostic challenges and treatment options contributes valuable insights to the existing literature, potentially guiding future research and clinical practices. Overall, I appreciate the manuscript's depth and clarity, as it addresses a critical public health issue in endemic regions, making it a noteworthy contribution to the scientific community.	
<b>Isthethitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)</b>	The title of the article, "Preoperatively Manifestations as Univesicular Mass Like Lesion and Postoperatively as Multivesicular Lesion with Multiple Daughter Cyst: A Very Rare Case Report," is somewhat lengthy and complex. A more concise and clear title could enhance its impact.	

**ReviewForm3**

<p><b>Istheabstractofthearticlecomprehensive?Doyousuggesttheaddition(ordeletion)ofsomepointsinthissection?Pleasewriteyoursuggestionshere.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the case, but it could be enhanced for clarity and completeness. Here are some suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Clarify Key Findings</b>: Explicitly state the significance of the findings regarding the transition from univesicular to multivesicular cysts. This will help readers understand the importance of the case.</li> <li><b>Add Diagnostic Methods</b>: Briefly mention the diagnostic methods used (e.g., imaging techniques) to provide context on how the diagnosis was reached.</li> <li><b>Include Treatment Outcome</b>: Summarize the postoperative outcome or follow-up results to highlight the effectiveness of the treatment.</li> <li><b>Streamline Language</b>: Simplify some phrases for better readability. For example, instead of "to best of our knowledge probably this is rare presentation," consider "to our knowledge, this is a rare presentation."</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript appears to be generally appropriate, with clear subsections such as the Abstract, Introduction, Case Report, and Discussion</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its thorough examination of a rare case of pulmonary hydatid cysts. The authors provide a detailed account of the patient's clinical presentation, diagnostic imaging, and surgical intervention, which aligns with established medical practices for managing hydatid disease. The inclusion of pathological findings further substantiates the diagnosis and enhances the credibility of the report. Additionally, the manuscript effectively references relevant literature, situating the case within the broader context of hydatid disease research, which underscores its contribution to the scientific community. Overall, the meticulous attention to detail and adherence to clinical standards reinforce the manuscript's scientific integrity.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>To assess the sufficiency and recency of the references, it would be important to consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recent Literature</b>: Ensure that the references include recent studies and reviews from the last 5-10 years, particularly those focusing on hydatid disease, its epidemiology, and management. This will provide a contemporary context to the case presented.</li> <li><b>Diversity of Sources</b>: The references should encompass a range of sources, including case reports, clinical guidelines, and systematic reviews, to support various aspects of the manuscript.</li> <li><b>Key Studies</b>: Including landmark studies or reviews that discuss the pathophysiology, diagnosis, and treatment of hydatid cysts would strengthen the manuscript.</li> </ol> <p>Suggestions for Additional References**:</p>	

**ReviewForm3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Isthe language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Ok- The language and English quality of the article exhibit several issues that may affect its suitability for scholarly communication. Here are some observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Grammar and Syntax</b>: There are multiple grammatical errors and awkward phrasings throughout the manuscript. For example, phrases like "milled hemoptysis" and "night sweetening" are not standard English and may confuse readers.</li> <li><b>Clarity and Coherence</b>: Some sentences are lengthy and convoluted, making it difficult to follow the author's intent. For instance, the description of the surgical procedure lacks clarity and could benefit from more straightforward language and structure.</li> <li><b>Terminology</b>: The use of medical terminology is inconsistent, and some terms may not be familiar to all readers. For example, "FOB" and "BAL" are used without explanation, which could hinder understanding for those not well-versed in medical jargon.</li> <li><b>Punctuation and Formatting</b>: There are issues with punctuation, such as missing commas and periods, which can disrupt the flow of reading. Additionally, the formatting of references and figures could be improved for better readability.</li> <li><b>Spelling Errors</b>: There are several spelling mistakes, such as "Albendassol" instead of "Albendazole," which detracts from the professionalism of the manuscript.</li> </ol> <p>Overall, while the manuscript contains valuable information, the language quality needs significant improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication. Editing for grammar, clarity, and consistency would enhance its readability and professionalism.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Based on the provided excerpts from the manuscript, I would assign an overall mark of <b>5</b> to this manuscript, indicating a <b>Serious Major Revision</b> is needed.</p> <p>### Rationale:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Language Quality</b>: The manuscript contains numerous grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and spelling mistakes, which significantly hinder readability and clarity.</li> <li><b>Structure and Organization</b>: While the manuscript includes essential sections such as the case report, discussion, and ethical compliance, the flow of information could be improved for better coherence.</li> <li><b>Scientific Rigor</b>: The case report presents interesting findings, but the discussion lacks depth and could benefit from a more thorough engagement with existing literature.</li> <li><b>Visual Aids</b>: The figures referenced in the manuscript are not adequately described, which may limit their effectiveness in supporting the text.</li> </ol>	

**ReviewForm3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mojtaba Esmailpour Roshan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Islamic Azad University of Garmsar, Iran</b>