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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Other

If other, please specify:

The report describes use of a new imaging modality for a well-knowned disease entity.

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?: Yes

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?: Yes

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

This is a well-written report regarding MR imaging of a paratesticular tumor.

The following issue needs rectification:

Legends for figure 4 and 5 are missing and the legend for figure 3 is confusing (it mentions regarding asterisk on the tumor and later refers to an asterisk on the mass. the figure in fact has no asterisk!).
There are limitations imposed by a single case report that can only be addressed by a report on use of the same imaging in unselected scrotal masses. The authors would be encouraged to follow up with a report on the use of MR imaging in scrotal masses.
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