Reviewer's report

Title: A case report of mesenteric mucinous cystoadenoma with review of the literature

Version: 4 Date: 17 August 2010

Reviewer: adriana handra-luca

Reviewer's report:

This is a report of a cystic lesion with unusual presentation: its mesenteric location and the associated clinical features.

Major compulsory revisions are required although several changes according to the previous review have been made.

Major Compulsory Revisions
The Conclusion section has to be brief; differential diagnosis and other discussion detail should be noted in the Case Report/Discussion section.

The manuscript should be checked for medical English (terms and phrases). The characteristics of this case should be compared to those of the already reported case of mesenteric location (age, gender, etc). The authors have to be more precise in what concerns the reference of the paper reporting this previous case, since one of the peculiarities is the site of the cyst.

Minor Revisions
Page 2: the point at the end of the sentences has to be added (4th and last sentence).
Page 3:
2nd sentence: the point at the end of the sentence should be added
Last paragraph: The authors can reformulate and indicate that the ultrasound and colonoscopy features of the mass were concordant and, suggestive of “an oval mass ///”. This sentence contains too many informations, it can be split into several.
Page 4: The abbreviation “TC” has to be written uniformly within the entire manuscript, and rather as “CT” (see page 6).

The precise pathology diagnosis, and the arguments which favor this diagnosis (although lack of ovarian-like stroma) should be clearly stated at the end of the pathology/immunohistochemistry description.

Page 5: After sentence 2, the authors can add that the patient was well after 2 years (information that is noted page 6, end of the Conclusion).

The pathogenesis paragraph should be simplified and shortened. The lack of ovarian-like stroma should be discussed.
The discussion of differential diagnoses (last sentence on the page) is more appropriate in the Case presentation/Discussion section.

Page 6: The Conclusion should be brief and avoid mixture with too many already reported data.

References: the references should be written according to the Instructions for Authors (no point at the end of the reference), the reference 5 should be checked for the word “retroperitoneal”.

Page 8: The figure legends would be more comprehensible if organized as complete sentences (subject, verb).
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