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Reviewer's report:

Summary
Atraumatic rupture of the spleen is an uncommon condition that may be associated with various etiologies. Splenic peliosis is a rare condition which has previously been described in association with splenic rupture. The Authors describe unique cases of atraumatic splenic rupture in which splenic peliosis was diagnosed following splenectomy.

Major Compulsory Revisions
I enjoyed reviewing the paper "Splenic peliosis with spontaneous splenic rupture: a report of 2 cases" by Lashbrook, et al.
I have the following questions and suggestions for the authors:
• Please specify the type of laparotomy in Case Presentation #1 and 2
• Case presentation #1 can be shortened
• The Authors should provide Reference of the sentence in the Conclusion Section "… detection of splenic peliosis warrants elective splenectomy or careful observation with regular follow up and imaging to detect disease progression"
• Laparoscopic splenectomy offers superior visualization and access to the spleen and avoids the major laparotomy incision necessary in open splenectomy. The Authors must comment in the Conclusion Section the advent of laparoscopic elective splenectomy for young patients with splenic peliosis (Mavor E. Surg Clin North Am. 2000;80:1285-97)

I think that the paper describes an interesting case report with unique pathological figures. I think that the Editors should not minimize the potential interest such a report will generate. Therefore, with the questions above answered by the Authors, I would support publication for this investigation. I would be interested in reviewing the paper again if you address these points raised by the reviewers; please understand I make no assurance as to final Editorial decision.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No