

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)
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.	This is a rare condition and its really important for the upcoming surgeons to know about it. I myself in my 20 years of experience have seen only two cases.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I would suggest this title; Laparoscopic Mesh Repair for a case of Hydrocele Canal of Nuck	
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.	Abstract is good.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	Although this is a rare surgical condition, its not a life threatening condition. Its more of a cosmetic problem or mild pain and worrying swelling. Young and upcoming surgeons dont have much of textbook description on this topic, even if so, not much on Laparoscopic repair. There are only few YouTube videos on this topic.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References are good enough.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	In the Discussion part (Line number .11) Type 2- Hydrocele with communication between the hydrocele and the peritoneal cavity If there is a communication, it should ne called as Hernia, if termed as Hydrocele, then, there should be a Subtype in that Hydrocele. Why was the 10 mm port inserted in the midclavicular line (instead of conventional Umblical), and if the other two ports are also in the left side, how did u prevent crowding of instruments?	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santhosh Kumar S
Department, University & Country	India