

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_127524
Title of the Manuscript:	A Rare Case of Hydrocele of Canal of Nuck in an Adult Female
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Hydrocele of the canal of Nuck is an uncommon condition, especially in adult females. While it is a well-documented phenomenon in neonates and infants, its occurrence in adults is rare, making this case report significant.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title "A Rare Case of Hydrocele of Canal of Nuck in an Adult Female" is suitable for the article.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, but there are some areas where it could be improved to ensure clarity and provide a more complete summary of the key points. Here's a breakdown of the strengths and areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While the rarity of the condition is mentioned, the abstract could better emphasize why this case is significant in the broader medical context. 2. Suggested addition: "Hydrocele of the canal of Nuck is a rarely diagnosed condition in adult females, often mistaken for more common conditions such as inguinal hernia or cystic lesions. 3. The conclusion is very brief and could be slightly expanded to reinforce the clinical relevance of the case, particularly the importance of considering this diagnosis in the differential for inguinal swellings in adult females 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript and its subsections appear appropriate for a case report</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive approach to a rare medical condition, backed by accurate clinical, diagnostic, and surgical information. The case is presented with detailed clinical findings, supported by imaging results (such as ultrasound), which are consistent with the diagnosis of hydrocele of the canal of Nuck. The surgical management using laparoscopic excision and TAPP repair aligns with current best practices for minimally invasive surgery, demonstrating a well-informed choice of technique. Additionally, the manuscript is grounded in solid embryological and anatomical knowledge, appropriately explaining the pathophysiology of the canal of Nuck and its relevance in adult females, further ensuring the scientific accuracy and technical reliability of the report</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references provided in your manuscript are relevant, scientifically sound, and mostly up to date. Suggestions for Additional References: Recent Reviews or Systematic Reviews: A recent review or systematic review on hydrocele of the canal of Nuck or inguinal swellings in adult females would provide a comprehensive overview of the condition, summarize different approaches to diagnosis and management, and further validate the findings in your case report. Including a review would give the manuscript a broader context.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article is generally clear, suitable for scholarly communication, with appropriate medical terminology and a professional tone.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	G. Jayalakshmi
Department, University & Country	Bharath Institute of Higher Education and Research, India