

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_113770
Title of the Manuscript:	Spontaneous cerebrospinal fluid leak and idiopathic intracranial hypertension: A CASE REPORT and literature review
Type of the Article	Case study

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>It is based only on the opinions and assumptions of the author, and is not confirmed by objective data. Only 1 case was analyzed. Repeated meningitis can lead to the death of the patient. The diagnosis of idiopathic intracranial hypertension was not confirmed in this case.</p> <p>The title of the article does not correspond to the content of the article. It should be titled "Author's Conjecture as to Causes of CSF Leakage and Justification for Failure to Treat Life-Threatening Condition"</p> <p>1. The subsections are named correctly, but the information presented in them does not correspond to the title of the subsection and the title of the article itself . Modern research methods for this pathology - CT and MRI cisternography, endoscopic examination - have not been used. The diagnosis of idiopathic intracranial hypertension as the cause of liquefaction is based only on the author's assumptions.</p> <p>2. There are very few recent references in the bibliography (over the last 5 years)</p> <p>6. The quality of CT and MRI is very low and does not meet the requirements of the journal. Moreover, MRI has data that can be used to identify the patient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article can be submitted for review by the editorial board after the correction of the comments described above and the successful treatment of the given patient</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andrii Sirko
Department, University & Country	Mechnikov Hospital, Ukraine