Reviewer’s report

**Title:** Mucinous cystadenoma of the appendix mimicking cystic hydatid disease: a case report

**Version:** 2 **Date:** 19 February 2008

**Reviewer:** Shinsuke Takeno

I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 9 criteria for evaluation in the journal: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

**Has the case been reported coherently?**: Yes

**Is the case report authentic?**: Yes

**Is this case worth reporting?**: Yes

**Is the case report persuasive?**: Yes

**Does the case report have explanatory value?**: No

**Does the case report have diagnostic value?**: Yes

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

**Is the anonymity of the patient protected?**: Yes

**Comments to authors:**

The manuscript entitled “Mucinous cystadenoma of the appendix mimicking cystic hydatid disease: a case report” describes a difficulty in the diagnosis of a rare disease “Mucinous cystadenoma of the appendix.”

The process or difficulty in preoperative diagnosis is well-written and discussed with appropriate literatures. I am sure this report will provide not only surgeons but also physicians a benefit in the diagnosis of an intra-abdominal cystic lesion.

However, a few points described below should be discussed for the publication.

1. Serodiagostics of echinococcal antigen revealed negative result in spite of high sensitivity or specificity in this case. Was systemic albendazole therapy adequate for the patient?

2. Did the authors consider the laparoscopic examination for clinical diagnosis before therapy although the author mentioned the risk of pseudomyxoma peritonei by PAIR when the cystic lesion was mucinous cystadenoma/
cystadenocarcinoma in Discussion?

3. Havenât the authors considered laparoscopic resection in the same manner?

4. There are misspelling, âcoecumâ and âpsedomyxomaâ in Discussion.

What next?: Accept after minor revisions

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