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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions: Please see items below.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Not entirely. Interesting approach to compare aggressive prostate cancer with non-aggressive prostate cancer, as these are (at least clinically) quite different conditions. However, it is unclear why Propionibacterium acnes, which has been associated with prostate cancer using various assays, was not included.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes.

3. Are the data sound? Unsure. The Abstract reports 128 cases, including 52 aggressive and 76 non-aggressive. So why do results report data for 49 aggressive and 66 non-aggressive? Please reconcile.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes, except for the omission of P acnes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Not entirely.
   If hypothesis is that no difference will be found (lines 80-83), then statistical power and likelihood of a Type 2 error must be discussed.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes, except for the omission of P acnes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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