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Dear sir,

I thank you for your comments and would like to submit the following formatting changes done in the manuscript, as desired:

1. Title: Has been changed as desired
2. Author list: checked and the e-mail addresses for each author provided
3. Affiliations of each author have been written in the format as suggested including the department, institute, city, and country.
4. "Corresponding author" has replaced "Principal author".
5. Qualifications: there are none on the page.
6. Abstract: The underline has been removed as suggested.
7. Abstract: Has been re-written as suggested with the help of a native English speaker.
8. "Introduction" has been changed to "Background"
9. In the background "squamous cell carcinoma" has been explained briefly.
10. In the background "Fournier’s gangrene" has been explained briefly.
11. Background: line 7: Changed as desired and reference has been provided to support improved survival with radio/chemotherapy.
12. Case Presentation: The period of 24 months/two years has been used through out the manuscript.
13. Case presentation, line 5: Fig.1 the reference has been removed.
14. Case presentation: line 6: New paragraph started with "Two years after discharge" as suggested.
15. Case presentation- line 7: "He was referred to the surgical out patient department" the sentence has been reframed.
16. Case presentation: line 10: The term "Well preserved" patient was used to suggest the nutritional status and has been replaced with "well nourished". "Performance status" based on Karnowski score was once again used to describe the functional and nutritional status of the patient. It has been replaced as desired.
17. New paragraph started with “There was a 6x7cm ulcer”.
18. Case presentation, Line 13: Right sided has been changed to right-hand side.
19. Case presentation, line 21: New paragraph with the sentence "The patient was put on third generation cephalosporins" has been reformatted.
20. Case presentation; line 22 "Antibiotics cephalosporins used along with the dosage has been explained.
21. Case presentation: line 26: The comment has been deleted as desired.
22. Case presentation: line 27, the details of the biopsy has been included.
23. Case presentation line 28: needful has been done "a" before wide has been included.
24. Case presentation line 30: the term enbloc has been explained and put in italics as suggested.
The features, which suggested it to be squamous cell carcinoma, have been explained along with the relevant references.

Discussion has been replaced with "conclusions" as suggested, the point is well taken.

Discussion: "epoch making" rephrased.

Discussion line 5: reference for the cause of scrotal carcinomas has been included.

Discussion: line 6- scar has been changed to "scars' as suggested.

Discussion paragraph 2: line 1: reference for prognosis depending on stage and grade of presentation has been mentioned.

Discussion, paragraph 2 line 4: squamous has been changed to lower case through out as suggested.

Discussion paragraph 2 line 7- I thank you for the references provided and these have been included in the discussion. The references have been re-arranged according to the journal style as suggested

Discussion: paragraph 3, line 2 "down stage" has been duly explained.

Authors contribution rewritten.

Acknowledgement has been changed as desired.

Figure legends rewritten "a high mitotic index" as desired--Fig.4

An effort made to do the needful for the figures as desired. Space around fig.3 reduced and fig.4 re-loaded without the "printed legend".

With kind regards
Yours sincerely
Chintamani