

Reviewer's report

Title: The Value of Routine Histopathological Examination of Appendicectomy Specimens

Version: 1 **Date:** 2 April 2007

Reviewer: Muhammed Ashraf Memon

Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Can patient explain why two severely dysplastic cystadenomas were treated differently - one with colonoscopy and other with CT scan. Also how long are they planning to monitor them and using what methods?

The remaining two carcinoids similarly are under surveillance. Once again how long for and using what methods?

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Under Results:

"Thirteen of.....the operating surgeon (carcinoids)" add table 1 in bracket here and remove "Eleven of.....metastatic ovarian carcinoma". This is because it is a repetition of what is nicely displayed in the table 1.

Add a separate heading "Incidental abnormal appendix/Treatment/Patients' Outcome" before "All cases.....". This will give a lot of clarity to the text.

Please remove the table from the text as it should be on a separate page following the references (see journal's instructions to authors - tables and captions).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

'I declare that I have no competing interests'