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

If other, please specify:

New surgical technique

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?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

General comments:

The authors present the case of a woman who underwent laparoscopic removal of a whole ovary for ovarian tissue cryopreservation using an endo-GIA forceps and clips. The idea to use this instrument in order to reduce ovarian injury by electrocoagulation is novel and interesting. However, the manuscript could be improved - see major and minor comments for details. Nonetheless, the manuscript will likely be acceptable after major revisions.
Revisions necessary for publication:

Major comments:

1. I recommend providing more details on the rationale for using the endo-GIA: Are there any studies demonstrating that electrocoagulation causes damage to the ovarian tissue in the course of ovarian tissue harvesting / cryopreservation?

2. Maybe the authors could provide some details in the results of the histological examination of the excised ovarian tissue (in many centers, one slice of ovarian tissue is examined histologically). Was intact ovarian tissue found? What about the presence of primordial follicles?

3. I totally miss a discussion section in the manuscript. A short discussion on previous results of the endo-GIA, especially in regard to tissue damage, and on the (possible) impact of electrocoagulatory ovarian tissue damage on the outcome of ovarian tissue harvesting and re-implantation would be interesting.

4. Many centers do not remove a whole ovary for ovarian tissue cryopreservation; instead only half to two-thirds of one macroscopically normal ovary’s cortex. It is unlikely that the endo-GIA can be used in these cases. Maybe the authors could comment on this.

5. The conclusion of the abstract says “[...] must diminish ovary injury [...]”. Since the authors present a case report and not a trial comparing the use of electrocoagulation to the endo-GIA, the authors should not draw a conclusion like this. They might change the phrase to “[...] MAY diminish ovarian injury [...]”.

Minor comments:

1. “Fertility preservation” might be added to the key words.

2. Introduction: As far as I know, it is not right that “stimulation is contraindicated as in breast cancer” (see Cuzick, Lancet 2007; Recchia, Cancer 2006).

3. Please correct the word order of the following sentence on page 2, paragraph 4 (introduction): “even despite being an experimental technique with few cases described of live births cases after transplantation”

4. May I ask why you report on a “5-12 mm trocar”? Normally, the width of a trocar is either 5mm or 12mm, isn’t it?

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