



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_45685
Title of the Manuscript:	Lumbar Extradural Synovial Cyst: An Uncommon Cause of Cauda Equina Syndrome
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are quite a few reviews that show a synovial cyst causes cauda equine syndrome, although it is not frequent. It is established that treatment of lumbar synovial cyst with spinal canal stenosis includes removal of the synovial cyst and laminectomy with posterior instrumentation. So, you should clearly state what things were different from other patients' clinical courses.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Your abstract consists of 13 lines. You mentioned your patient only in 4.5 lines. The most essential thing in the abstract of case report is to describe the clinical course of the patient. Introduction You need to clearly state what was worth reporting the patient. Case report You need to clearly state the most important findings in the patient. Discussion I do not recommend that you review usual treatments of lumbar synovial cyst with spinal canal stenosis. You need to clearly state what was worth reporting the patient.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kazuo Higa
Department, University & Country	Fukuoka University, Japan