Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_88120**
Title of the Manuscript:	**BRONCHOGENIC CYST: A RARE 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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	-Authors write in the Introduction: "About 70% of bronchogenic cyst produce some symptoms but 90% of mediastinal bronchogenic cyst are asymptomatic…." **Comment:** this cannot be true. Namely, if 70 % of bronchogenic cyst produce some symptoms, then 90 % of mediastinal bronchogenic cyst cannot be asymptomatic, especially because they are the most common (in 65-90%). Authors must check this. - There are several abbreviations in the text. Authors must explain them the first time they appear or give abbreviation list at the beginning. - There are several grammatical errors that must be corrected. - Authors should explain the treatment outcome or at least a treatment plan (for example, surgical removal is planned) if it was not already done	
Minor REVISION comments	- Authors write in the Case report section:: "All blood parameters were normal" **Comment:** they should at least give a list of these parameters and not neccessarily give their values. - The references are mostly old. Some more recent references should be added. In addition, they must be written in an uniform way and in accordance with Author guidelines. For example, list of the first six authors should be written followed by et al. and not only three authors, like in this text.	
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)***	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Matjaž Kopač**
Department, University & Country	**University Medical Centre Ljubljana, Slovenia**