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General

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

Authors present a cavity management technique after conservative hydatid liver surgery, named as modified capitonnage. There are some points which require to clarify:

Major Compulsory Revisions and Discretionary Revisions

1. What are the advantages of this technique over the known capitonnage and introflexion? Both these known techniques can be used without omentum as well.
2. With two cases experience, isn’t it very difficult to say that this technique eliminates most of the major postoperative complications after hydatid liver surgery?
3. Major determinant of the postoperative biliary and cavity related complications after hydatid surgery is the content of the cyst, not the cavity management technique. In the text, contents of the cysts were not mentioned. Have you ever seen any biliary orifices in the cyst cavities?
4. The limitations and the potential risks of the procedure are not mentioned. For example, is this technique suitable for all hydatid liver cysts and is there a risk of injury to bile ducts and vessels while passing the sutures from the pericyst wall?
5. Other cavity management techniques are also provides to patients to mobilize on postoperative day one. Therefore, I believe this technique has not any advantage on postoperative mobilization of the patients.
6. In the last photograph (with drain), the completed technique looks like introflexion rather than capitonnage.
7. Details of the scolicidals are not mentioned. Which concentration?, How long?

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

Minor notes:
Hydadid should be hydatid
Tude should be tube
Capitonage should be capitonnage

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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