Reviewer's report

Title: Traumatic Pulmonary Pseuodocysts: Two Case Reports

Version: 2 Date: 18 May 2007

Reviewer: Rajesh Bhagat

I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 7 criteria for evaluation in the journal: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Comments to authors:

General
For a case to be publishable it has to have some novel idea/ability to contribute to literature. And every case has the potential to achieve that, provided it is highlighted/stressed/brought out by the authors. Finally the case has to be put in context of the published literature.

I agree traumatic pulmonary pseudocysts are very rare. There are published small case series and published cases. The brief case histories given in the manuscript are not enough to bring out the uniqueness of the cases. Authors are not very persuasive.

The manuscript will have to be extensively edited. There are certain scientific/English terms which are used in the English manuscripts and are consistent.....Chest Radiographs or Chest Roentgenograms are the preferred term instead of graphs. Even Chest X-ray is better. Another example of inconsistency is occurrence of TPP is described as uncommon, at another place as rare, and then not a common entity. There should be consistency between abstract, introduction and discussion.

The review of literature is limited. A series of 14 cases is not mentioned (European J Cardiothoracic Surgery 2003). A table compiling all the reports in literature will help strengthen the case for publication of manuscript. Discussion of other reports/case reports even from medical/pulmonary journals will be helpful - I realize this manuscript is from a Surgical Department, however, review of literature is not bound by such boundaries and ideally should not be limited to surgical journals only.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Revisions necessary for publication

1. More information about the cases and stress on their unique features.
2. Consistency in use of terms through out the manuscript.
3. Use of standard terms.
4. In discussion - more extensive review including a possible table comparing different studies/case reports.
5. Figure 3 patient identifiers to be removed.
6. Edit the manuscript.

What next?: Reject
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited