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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?
   Yes/

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments: no ethical concerns

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?
   Yes/

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.
   a. The relevant patient information, including:
      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
      - Main symptoms of the patient
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes
   b. The relevant physical examination findings
c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: yes

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?
Comments: yes

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.
Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Comments: yes

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments: yes

9. Additional comments for the author(s)? yes
1) on line 67, 68: Treatment modalities are dependent on the case presentation. Women have been managed expectantly, medically with methotrexate or surgically (2,5). Also vacuum aspiration method is used for the treatment of the CSP, that can be found on the link: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30338082


2) on line 86-87: She declined a "Doppler" ultrasound evaluation scheduled for the next day. Later on when you examined the patient, could you managed to perform Doppler US? if yes what's the result?

3) on line 103: Because of the uncertainty, excision was postponed. what were the uncertainty here? it would be better to mention differencial diagnosis here as well. Also without uncertainty is it prudent to operate a patient? therefore it would be better to say that you performed diagnostic laparoscopy and hysteroscopy to identify the diagnosis...

4) Why did you perform MRI; why were you not sure about your prediagnosis, it would be better to discuss those differential diagnosis to understand the situation much better.

5) on line 107: An emergency laparotomy was then performed on the same day why did you not try hysteroscopy again? also you made it certain that the diagnosis was CSP. it would be better to discuss how you chose to perform laparatomy here.

Kind regards...
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