

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_84617
Title of the Manuscript:	Multiple Schwannomas masquerading as a Disseminated Hydatid disease in a Female- A Diagnostic Dilemma- A case report
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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/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		
Minor REVISION comments	These would be my remarks regarding the paper you submitted to me for review. In the presentation of the case, the authors state that ultrasound was used and give a description of the ultrasound finding, but the paper lacks a recording of the ultrasound examination where you can see the changes listed in the text. Furthermore, the CT scan shows only reconstructions in the coronal plane, images in the axial and sagittal planes are missing. Also, a detailed explanation should be given for the attached CT images, and if possible, the gaps should be marked with arrows. All in all, the paper is interesting and deserves to be published after eliminating the above shortcomings.	Noted sir. Ultrasound pictures added. Additional axial and sagittal CT scan images added. Page no. 3, 4
Optional/General comments		

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 ethical issues with this manuscript.