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Dear Dr. Rosser,

Thank you for reviewing our submitted manuscript entitled “Stage I seminoma: Treatment outcomes in a low-income country”.

Below are the responses to the reviewer’s comments. Also find the enclosed revised manuscript. All revisions were made in red font.

Thank you for considering this manuscript for publication.

Kind regards,

Jamal Khader MD

King Hussein Cancer Center

HM Queen Rania Street

P.O.Box: 1269, Amman 11941

Amman, Jordan

Tel.: +962 788 305344

Email: jkhader@khcc.jo
Reviewer: Ahmed Mansour

Comments:

- Title: Current title isn’t related to the scope of the article at all. Should be changed.
  Title has been changed as requested

- Objective: Potential predictors of relapse were not evaluated in the article, only 3 patients developed relapse and the numbers don’t allow for performing a sound multivariate analysis of predictors of recurrence. “potential predictors of relapse” should be deleted
  This has been deleted

- Surgical violation of the scrotum in testicular cancer patients isn’t related to the level of country’s development. Any tertiary care cancer center will receive a fair share of these patients. This theme should be changed in the introduction
  The theme has been changed as requested

- Discussing the nature of the health system in Jordon in the initial two paragraphs of the discussion has nothing to do with the paper. Please change
  This has been changed accordingly

- Protocol of chemotherapy provided to the patients who developed relapse should be described
  The protocol has been described in table 2

- Tumor marker levels prior to orchiectomy should be mentioned, what proportion of patients had high BHCG?
  This has been mentioned in the results section

- What percentage of patients had ipsilateral pelvic surgery (inguinal herniorrhaphy, orchiopexy…) prior to radiation? It is known that such procedures alter the lymphatic drainage of the testicle and irradiation of the ipsilateral iliac and inguinal LN including the surgical scar is recommended. Please comment.
  We have reviewed the charts of these patients and we have commented on this issue in the results section

- Since the majority of the patients had adjuvant radiation, would be interesting to comment on patients’ fertility on long term and whether sperm banking was performed prior to orchiectomy/ radiation.
  This point has been addressed in the methods section

English and typos:
- “were burdened by relapse” should be changed to “developed relapse” throughout the article
This has been changed throughout

-“Initial treatment almost always includes inguinal orchiectomy” should be changed to “High inguinal orchiectomy is the standard initial treatment”
This has been changed accordingly

-“narrated” should be changed to reported
This has been changed

-Typo: “through history” should be “thorough history”
This has been corrected

-Typo: “Follow-up was in the form of a patient visit”
This has been corrected

-“The length of follow-up ranged from 1 to 200 months…….” should be moved to the results section
This has been moved to the results section

“At the time of follow-up; all but one patient remain alive” should be “were”
This has been corrected

-“CT scan of the abdomen in the patient harboring regional recurrence was co-registered with simulation CT scan” should be “CT scan of the abdomen of the patient who developed regional recurrence was compared to the simulation CT scan”
This has been corrected

1) -Don’t include single line paragraphs. Bad writing
The manuscript does not include single line paragraphs
Reviewer: Kazunori Namiki

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Please show the details of the chemotherapy regimen for the 3 relapse cases.
   This has been addressed in table 2

2. It is not unclear the meaning of table 4. It seems that it is not important for this manuscript. If the authors want to describe the tumor marker kinetics, it is better to add the range and SD of the abnormal value.
   Table 4 has been omitted. Important details concerning preoperative tumor markers were incorporated in the results section

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Patients and Methods, third paragraph, "patients visit9 to...". Please double-check to "...".
   This has been corrected