

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_82941
Title of the Manuscript:	Psoas abscess secondary to appendicitis complicated by pleural effusion
Type of the Article	Case study

**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> )

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Well written throughout the article, however: -                      The abstract seems to read as statements, it may be useful to restructure it ensure it flows more smoothly                      It may be useful to explain the reasoning behind the mortality of 19% in secondary psoas abscess.                      Was there any evidence of changes in the lung bases on the initial imaging?                      The pleural effusion is of a significant volume and cannot be attributed solely to the underlying intra-abdominal pathology.                      Did the patient have any underlying pulmonary pathology? Any history of being immunocompromised? A brief relevant past medical history/surgical history would highlight any indicators to a poor pre-morbid status.                      Did the patient require Airway or breathing support or solely was in ICU as a Level 2 patient?                      What did the peripheral blood cultures grow? Any specific organisms? This could explain the incidence of a intra-thoracic fluid collection</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Extending the abstract to include more details can potentially garner further interest from the readers.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>The use of diagnostic imaging within this case study further embodies the message that the authors intend to portray. Well done                      Overall, this is a well written article, consideration of the above comments/suggestion may further improve the quality of the article</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Debkumar Chowdhury</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University Of Glasgow, United Kingdom</i></b>