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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Use the full term in the text as it first appears rather than as a list of abbreviations at the end of the article (i.e. POD, CA 125 etc.)

In my opinion, in the description of laparoscopy findings, the authors should only state the appearance and size of the right ovary as a comparison to the left ovary, rather than calling it "remnant right ovary". At this initial stage of the report, it seems presumptive to use the term. The use of the term "remnant ovary" is however been appropriately used in the discussion section, with the explanation of the most likely mechanism in this case.
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