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Reviewer’s report:

Interesting case report worth publishing. It can be accepted after minor essential revisions:

- It has been mentioned that immature elements had been found histopathologically. Therefore, differential diagnosis between immature teratoma should be made and discussed in the conclusion section. It is not convincing why the diagnosis was “malignant transformation of a mature cystic teratoma” and not an “immature teratoma”.
- It would be better to cite Figures 1B, 1C, 1D and 1E in the manuscript.
- The figures would be more informative with arrows added pointing out different parts of the biopsy.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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