

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJCRS_117926
Title of the Manuscript:	A Case of a Giant Appendiceal Mucocele
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>YES</p> <p>COULD BE BETTER</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>NO, FORMAT IS NOT CORRECT</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES, MINOR SYNTAX ERROR NEED CORRECTION</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Overall, a rare condition, nicely managed, reasonably well-written, this is a good case for reporting. But needs more clarity in some aspects before it can be published</p> <p>2. Improve TITLE to something like: "<i>Diagnostic Challenge and Management of a Giant Appendiceal Mucocele: Report of a case</i>"</p> <p>3. Last sentence in INTRODUCTION should say: "Herewith we present a case of....."</p> <p>4. This sentence is confusing, please re-write: "<i>colonoscopy was done in January 2022 which showed a cecal lesions versus appendiceal submucosal lesion, and random biopsies showed normal colon mucosa</i>"</p> <p>5. According to colonoscopy findings, did you visualize the appendiceal lumen in the cecum? If so, what was the size of the lumen? This finding is crucial to the decision whether a simple appendectomy is enough or a right hemicolectomy is needed.</p> <p>6. You could have just done a simple laparoscopic appendectomy using a stapler with a vascular load to resect the base. Please explain this</p> <p>7. I had published in 2006 in the Indian J Gastro: "Laparoscopic appendectomy for mucocele of the appendix: Report of 8 cases." The incidence of mucocele of the appendix in our center was 0.15%, of a total of 6000 appendectomies over 8 years. We operated on 9 cases; laparoscopic appendectomy was done in 8 of them. One patient had pseudomyxoma peritonei, so open surgery was done.</p> <p>8. REFERNCES format is wrong, please re-write</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Rangarajan Muthukumaran
Department, University & Country	Bahamas