



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 60061

Title: Postoperative discal pseudocyst and its similarities to discal cyst: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03071853

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Neurosurgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-10-17

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-20 11:29

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-30 16:13

Review time: 10 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

The Authors report two cases of postoperative discal pseudocyst. The condition is rare. While the first case is very interesting and unusual, the second is not as well defined and could be a simple early recurrent herniation. For this reason I suggest to remove the second case and focus the article on the first, also describing better the radiological characteristics. There was CSF leakage during or after the operation? If not, please specify it in the text. The literature review was carried out carefully