

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_84775
Title of the Manuscript:	Large Asymptomatic Mucocoele of The Appendix – An Incidental Finding
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Summary <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ The summary is too long, it should be 250 words maximum✓ The case presentation and discussion could be removed from the summary, and only the aim and conclusion kept in one paragraph.	The summary has been revised as per editor's comments.
Minor REVISION comments	Case presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ The description of the clinical examination should precede the description of the ultrasound signs✓ Figure 1: put instead "CT scan in axial section with contrast injection, showing a dilated appendix in FID (arrow) Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ First paragraph: put instead "medical imaging examination" instead of a "radiographic imaging"✓ Second paragraph: Delete with poor enhancement✓ Highlight the advantage of CT over ultrasound in the diagnosis of mucocoele	Case presentation- <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Since the ultrasound was done for health check-up purpose in an asymptomatic person, and the patient was later referred to the surgeon after USG report was suggestive of mucocoele, hence we the clinical examination was conducted later. This chronological order is unique in this particular case and hence cannot be re-edited.• Figure 1 description is changed as per suggestion Discussion- Changes done as advised. Advantage of CT over Usg has been incorporated in discussion. Some new references added in the discussion.
Optional/General comments	No comment	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No