

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83923

Title: Ruptured teratoma mimicking a pelvic inflammatory disease and ovarian malignancy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03976790

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: DSc, PhD

Professional title: Emeritus Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: France

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-29 12:30

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-01 07:41

Review time: 2 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments about the manuscript: "Ruptured teratoma mimicking a pelvic inflammatory disease and ovarian malignancy: a case report" The manuscript concerns a case of ovarian teratoma rupture in a 60-year-old woman studied by several methods. This case resembles pelvic inflammatory disease or ovarian malignancy. The non-specific symptoms show that it is necessary to clarify information on ovarian teratomas in order to structure diagnosis and treatment. This case, which provides additional elements for knowledge of ovarian teratomas, deserves to be published. I will, however, make a few remarks for the improvement of the manuscript. Page 6, Treatment. "Frozen sections": a description of the histological sections would be useful. Please give some clarification on the sections: what was the fixative used? Are they really frozen sections, wouldn't they be paraffin sections (see remarks about figure 3)? Specify the staining (hemalun-eosin, it seems to me)? The scale bars are not visible enough. Page 8 : " This report illustrates one case. The results of this report may not be applicable to another case of ruptured teratoma. Therefore, these results should be interpreted with caution.": I appreciate the honesty and prudence of the authors, which I would like to emphasize. Page 14, figure 3.

Could the sentence "Pathology of the tumor" be replaced with "Histopathological study of the tumor". In the text, it talks about frozen sections, but given the exceptional quality of the pictures, would it not be more paraffin sections? Especially since fat balls are not observed. Please confirm whether or not they are frozen sections or paraffin-embedded tissues.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83923

Title: Ruptured teratoma mimicking a pelvic inflammatory disease and ovarian malignancy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05061299

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-05 07:38

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-14 01:46

Review time: 8 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The acronym TOA is not explained in the text. 2. In the exposition of the laboratory studies reference is made to cultures of the abdominal contents, but it is not specified if the sample was obtained preoperatively or after surgery. 3. Why the possibility of an intraoperative biopsy was not considered due to the suspicion of possible ovarian neoplasia, which would require more radical surgery.