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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is an interesting case report presenting a rare case of ruptured appendiceal cystadenoma with localized pseudomyxoma peritonei presenting as right inguinal hernia in a patient with colon cancer. Our recommendation is to ACCEPT the paper subject to MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISION based on the following comments:

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

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

1. The title should be changed to describe the case more accurately. The following is suggested: "Ruptured Appendiceal Cystadenoma Presenting as Right Inguinal Hernia in a Patient with Colon Cancer: A Case Report and Review of Literature".

2. Line 11 of the case report description: "We noted that no oral contrast media was leaking from the cecum into the peritoneal cavity (Figure 3)." Explain more. What did you use?

3. Line 5 of the discussion: "A second tumor originating from gastrointestinal tract, ovary, breast and kidney has been reported [12]." Rewrite sentence with more explanation.

4. Line 9 of the discussion: "We reviewed our ten patients with appendiceal mucoceles receiving appendectomies during the past 13 years. Three of them had presented as ruptured lesions. None of the other patients was diagnosed to have colonic cancer. The concomitant pathologies are often clinically silent [1]. This patient was also asymptomatic before the rupture of the mucocele and its presentation as right inguinal hernia. This description should be made more clear and be expanded. You mention more patients than the presented case and explanations should be more detailed. The conclusion from the study of these additional patients is not clear.

5. The last sentence of the discussion, which acts as conclusions of the study, should be a separate paragraph and should not contain references. Move these references (25, 26, 27) further up in the discussion.

6. The annotated text follows in the next page. Address all comments. English has problems and should be fixed before second submittal.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions