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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
I have read this manuscript with great interest. The present case is an interesting case of a common misdiagnosis in the everyday clinical practice. First of all, a language revision is needed in order to improve the quality of the manuscript. A recent published paper (Perivoliotis K, et al. Low-Grade Appendiceal Mucinous Neoplasm (LAMN) Primarily Diagnosed as an Ovarian Mucinous Tumor. Case Rep Surg. 2021 Apr 22;2021:5523736. doi: 10.1155/2021/5523736.) discussed the same subject. Please refer the present work and revise your discussion.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
In this case, the adnexal mass was suspected and was admitted to the obstetrics and gynecology department. However, preoperative MRI diagnosed it as an appendiceal tumor and adnexal mass could be excluded. This article is considered to be useful in that MRI greatly contributed to preoperative diagnosis. Therefore, the findings and considerations for images should be enhanced. > The image explained in Figure 1 is only for diagnosis, and the findings are scarce. Please consider in “discussion” whether there were any findings suggestive of LAMN by echo or CT. > It is suspected to be mucinous neoplasm on MRI of the appendix, please describe in the “Imaging examination” what kind of findings you suspected to be a malignant neoplasm. > In “Discussion”, the characteristic of MRI findings of LAMN are shown. This case is a perforated case, It is interesting that "gourd-shaped" appendix was shown, although LAMN was perforated already. The "gourd-shaped" or characteristic picture should be on the figure. > The image in Figure 2 and the actual figure legends are different, so please correct them.
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