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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Findings that shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect

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:

The title of the paper is appropriate.

The keywords are suitable for this case.

The length of the abstract is suitable, however, at the end of the abstract the clinical significance of this very rare variant should be added by the authors.

The terminology used needs to be consistent throughout the manuscript. The authors use the term “variant” but in another paragraph they mention the term “anomaly”. The same occurs in Discussion section. I believe that, as the authors were not aware of any abnormalities caused by that finding, it should be named “variant”. 
What was the cause of death of the cadaver?

What was the diameter of the testicular artery?

The anatomical and embryological sections are well explained but there is a need for more background for clinical conditions.

The reference list is too extensive and it should be limited.

The labeling of the figure should be improved in order to contain the related anatomical structures.

The schematic drawings are of good quality and informative.
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