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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?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

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

Comments to authors:

General

The authors report a case of adrenal hydatid disease that was resected laparoscopically for therapeutic and diagnostic purposes. The case is unusual and is therefore worthy of publication. The emphasis, however, should be on the role of laparoscopic surgery in hydatid disease. Although I appreciate English is not their first language, there are numerous spelling and grammatical errors that need correcting. The authors should be encourage to revise and resubmit their case history

Revisions necessary for publication

Greater emphasis in the discussion regarding the role of laparoscopic surgery. In particular:

1) Can laparoscopic surgery be used to resect hydatid cysts in the liver or lungs?
2) How does this technique compare to open surgery or aspiration and injection of a cysticide?
3) What are the benefits to patients compared to open surgery. For example, less surgical scarring, less post operative pain and shorter length of in patient stay
4) Could this technique be performed in a resource limited setting where hydatid disease is endemic?
5) What is the experience of others? Reference 6 is alluded too.

I suggest the title is 'Primary hydatid cyst of the adrenal gland resected laparoscopically'

Less emphasis on the radiology of hydatid disease. This is already well described

The authors need to specify which serological assay was performed. I assume that this was a latex particle agglutination test performed at a reference laboratory.

The absence of eosinophilia in hydatid disease is well recorded. In fact, eosinophilia is more likely to occur if the cyst leaks.

I fail to understand the importance of both figure 1a and 1b. In figure 2 an arrow pointing out 'calcified protoscolices' (mispelt) would be helpful

There are numerous spelling and grammatical errors that need correcting.
Under author's contribution, the categories 'study conception and design' and 'analysis and interpretation' of data are inappropriate.

What next?: Revise and resubmit

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited