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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?
   
   not sure.

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 few points are missing:

   1. the authors describe 'fibrous peritoneal fluid' - not sure if this a correct term. are they trying to say 'fibrinous'??

   2. Was the peritoneal fluid cultured? if yes, what is the result..

   3. the authors mention 'right ovary was enlarged and discharging pus' - was it cystic filled with pus? was it ruptured due to fluid collection? was oophorectomy/partial oophorectomy was performed. what was the histologic findings?

   4. was their any signs of acute appendicitis on histopathology?

   5. how the authors explain the pathogenesis of the ovarian abscess?

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

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

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

Comments: no.

see comments above.

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: no. the whole pathogenesis of the ovarian abscess is very vague and it lacks many important points in discussion.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

the case report is interesting; however it lacks several important key points in regards to the pathogenesis and the clinical course.

as mentioned earlier the case reports lacks a definite cause and effect interconnection.
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