

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_88029
Title of the Manuscript:	Mesothelial cyst masquerading as hydrocele of the cord in a male child: case report.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>We fully appreciate the effort made by colleagues to accomplish this report. Having professed my general enthusiasm for the topic and its importance, I commend the authors for a number of strengths of their work, including the rarity of such pathology in a pediatric age group. I found the article emerges a good lesson, interesting and insightful and particularly it addresses the issue of this rare pathology. The report has an important clinical message and should be of great interest to the readers.</p> <p>I recommend the manuscript for publication after some adjustments have been taken into account.</p> <p>Please pay attention, review the attached comments (yellow colored icons in the main text), and rewrite the article accordingly as possible.</p>	<p>Ultrasound confirmed its cystic nature as seen</p> <p>An ultrasound image has been added for better understanding</p> <p>region from two weeks</p> <p>corrected as advised of two weeks duration</p> <p>After high ligation of the sac</p> <p>Corrected to high ligation of the hernia sac</p> <p>It was present in the subcutaneous area just lateral to the inguinal canal. On further exploration, it was a multiseptated cystic structure and had serosanguinous fluid.</p> <p>A peroperative picture could not be taken as we considered it to be a very straight forward case</p> <p>No evidence of granulomatous disease or malignancy was found</p> <p>Placed as a part of the case</p> <p>He is in regular follow up from two months and is doing well to date.</p> <p>Part of the continuation of case report not the fig frame</p> <p>Fig1.10x HPE shows the epithelium lined by mesothelium with inflammatory cells infiltrate</p> <p>Fig1.Histopathological examination at the magnification of 10x shows fibro adipose with inflammatory cells infiltrate lined by mesothelial cells.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Comment [MA1]:** For the journal audiences , it is better to add the images of US study with its dimentions.

**Comment [Ma2R1]:** An image has been added for the audiences hoping for a better understanding

**Comment [MA3]:** Of two weeks duration.

**Comment [Ma4R3]:** Corrected grammtical error

**Comment [MA5]:** Sac of what!

**Comment [Ma6R5]:** Hernia sac

**Comment [MA7]:** Again for the journal readers , it is anice addition to the report to have the peroperative images!

**Comment [Ma8R7]:** Sorry we did not take a picture of the peroperative image as we considered it to be a straight forward case.

**Comment [MA9]:** This comment can be conclusive as a part of case presentation or at the end of the image report!

**Comment [Ma10R9]:** Placed as a part of the case

**Comment [MA11]:** No place of such comment in the figure frame! You already submitted that in the case presentation.

**Comment [Ma12R11]:** This is a part of the case presentation and not of the fig frame.

**Comment [MA13]:** Please re write the figure comments in more organized one!

**Comment [MA14]:** Please re write the figure comments in more organized one!

**Comment [Ma15R14]:** Done hopefully this one is better

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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>No IRB or institutional approval.</p> <p>Acknowledgment section should be add.</p>	<p>IRB approval present with attached document is being resent again.</p> <p>Acknowledgement section added</p>