

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_122182
Title of the Manuscript:	Cervical bronchogenic cyst causing inspiratory stridor
Type of the Article	Case report

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it addresses a rare but critical condition that can present with acute respiratory distress in pediatric patients. The detailed case study and analysis provide valuable insights into the diagnosis and management of bronchogenic cysts, enhancing the medical community's understanding of how such cysts can manifest and impact respiratory function. Additionally, the manuscript contributes to the broader knowledge base by presenting a unique case, which can inform clinicians about potential complications and guide future research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, good title.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its meticulous case documentation and thorough analysis of cervical bronchogenic cyst. The authors provide a detailed account of the patient's clinical presentation, diagnostic process, and treatment outcomes, supported by relevant imaging and histopathological evidence. Their use of current, evidence-based methodologies and adherence to established diagnostic criteria ensures that the findings are both accurate and reliable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent however addition of few more would be worthwhile.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is good.	
Optional/General comments	The case report is good, however few more images with proper annotation should be added.	

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:	Aniket Madhukar Zope
Department, University & Country	Symbiosis Medical College for Women & Symbiosis University Hospital and Research Centre, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), India