

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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	The manuscript discusses a specific case of Bronchogenic cyst affecting pulmonary functioning. The case can help the scientific community in understanding the case. The types of medical imaging techniques used to detect the presence of cyst have been indicated.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The author can elaborate on the symptoms, what causes the cyst at an early stage and the alternative methods of diagnosis.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it clearly specifies the method of diagnosis. The identification of cyst using imaging techniques and others are also presented. There is also discussion of following up on the case post-surgery.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Only 2 papers are recent one. Additional four references may be added. Reference has to be added for Maier classified the cyst as paratracheal, carinal, para-esophageal, hilar, and miscellaneous.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes but the manuscript requires English and grammar corrections.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Bhavani K
Department, University & Country	Visvesvaraya Technological University (VTU), India