

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55999

Title: "The Great Mimicker: A case of ruptured lung cyst"

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Date: 31.01.26

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study

- **Originality:** The case report highlights an uncommon presentation of pulmonary hydatid cyst mimicking pneumonia, which is valuable for clinical awareness.
- **Clinical Relevance:** Emphasizes the importance of considering hydatid disease as a differential diagnosis in endemic regions, especially in non-resolving pneumonia or TB-like cases.
- **Diagnostic Approach:** Utilizes comprehensive imaging modalities (chest X-ray and CT scan) and histopathology for definitive diagnosis.
- **Multidisciplinary Management:** Demonstrates effective combination of pharmacotherapy and surgical intervention.
- **Educational Value:** Highlights key radiological signs such as the "air bubble sign" and "water-lily sign," which are useful in diagnosis.

Weaknesses of the Study

- **Limited Literature Review:** The discussion provides a broad overview but lacks critical comparison with similar cases or current controversies.
- **Sample Size:** As a single case report, it inherently limits generalizability.
- **Serological Testing:** The serology for hydatid disease was negative, but the authors do not elaborate on the sensitivity or specificity, or whether confirmatory tests were performed.
- **Methodological Details:** Lack of details regarding ethical approval, informed consent, and specific surgical or pharmacological protocols.
- **Language and Clarity:** Occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasing hinder clarity.
- **Figures and Tables:** Figures are referenced but not included in the provided excerpt, affecting overall comprehension.
- **References:** Some references are outdated or lack complete citations; their relevance could be improved.

Reviewer Comments

- **Title and Abstract Clarity:** The title is concise but could be more descriptive, e.g., "A Rare Case of Ruptured Pulmonary Hydatid Cyst Mimicking Pneumonia." The abstract effectively summarizes the case but can benefit from clearer separation of sections such as background, case presentation, and conclusion for better readability.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction adequately introduces hydatid disease but would benefit from a more precise statement of the specific objectives or hypotheses, especially emphasizing the diagnostic challenge.
- **Methodology and Statistical Analysis:** As a case report, formal statistical analysis is not applicable. However, detailed methodology regarding imaging techniques, serological testing, surgical procedures, and histopathological confirmation should be elaborated. Ethical approval and patient consent are not mentioned but are essential.
- **Results and Discussion:** The presentation of clinical findings aligns with standard practice. The discussion covers relevant clinical features, diagnostic signs, and treatment options, yet it lacks depth in discussing differential diagnoses' nuances and outcome measures.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusion appropriately emphasizes the importance of differential diagnosis. It could be strengthened by suggesting specific clinical guidelines or protocols for physicians in endemic areas.
- **Ethical Clearance:** There is no mention of ethical approval or patient consent, which is a significant omission for ethical standards in case reporting.
- **Language, Grammar, and Typographical Errors:** Minor grammatical errors are present; for example, inconsistent verb tense and awkward phrasing. Overall, a thorough language review is recommended.
- **Figures, Tables, Formatting, and References:** Figures are referenced but missing in the provided document; their inclusion is necessary for clarity. Formatting is generally acceptable, but references need standardization and updating for completeness and relevance.

Additional Note: Based on the review of the content provided and standard practices for scholarly publications, there are no indications or evidence within the text suggesting that this particular study has been previously published on the internet or elsewhere. To conclusively verify whether this work has been previously published, a dedicated plagiarism check or database search (e.g., PubMed, Google Scholar, or institutional repositories) would be necessary.