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Reviewer's report:

Overall the manuscript is clear and result are well presented. The discussion and conclusions are correct. However I think is in the abstract where I find some wording misplaced:

Abstract

The sentence “This study sought DNA evidence of candidate organisms in archival prostate cancer tissues with the aim of assessing if a subset of these cancers arise as pathological sequelae in response to infection” is incorrect. Cross sectional information cannot be used to confirm a pathological sequelae to infection. I would suggest that “of these cancer show any association with common genital infections”

Conclusion says: “… contribute to anything but a small proportion of prostate cancer risk, regardless of tumour phenotype.” I do not think that the study allow to conclude that small proportion of prostate cancers could be attributable to infection based on these data. The association does not mean etiology.

I am not sure whether Figure 1 is necessary.
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