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Reviewer's report:

• Minor essential revisions

Abstract- No word count. Style of abstract is not as outlined in Instructions for Authors.

Background- Manuscript style is not per journal’s recommendations and must be corrected. There is no hypothesis stated. There is no debate over the treatment of retractile testes. There are two types of testes: undescended and descended. Undescended may be noted at birth or less commonly might not be diagnosed until later (ascending- histologically true undescended testes). Descended testes are scrotal though some may be retractile. This is a normal finding and this point cannot be stressed enough. There is no debate over the treatment of normal retractile testes- no treatment is needed. This point must be made clear in the manuscript.

Results- What are the ages of the FP who referred patients earlier for treatment vs those that delayed treatment? What was the reason for the post-orchiopexy hormonal treatment? In 8/88 patients, the surgery was not successful- this is technically a complication, especially when a second surgery was required or there was loss of a testis. Why did 10 boys with retractile testes have surgery. True retractile testes never need surgery since this is a normal cremateric reflex. Were these instead later diagnosed ascending UTs? If so then they should be labeled as so.

Discussion- Further discussion is needed concerning the difference in the diagnosis and treatment of normal retractile testes and undescended “ascending” testes diagnosed later.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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