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Author's response to reviews:

Revision remarks
“Laparoscopic and open postchemotherapy retroperitoneal lymph node dissection in patients with advanced testicular cancer a single center analysis“

Berlin, 22.04.2012

Dear editors, dear reviewers,

Thank You for Your helpful comments. We extensively revised the manuscript regarding language aspects. Please find our reply to both reviewers’ remarks below. We hope that our revised article is now suitable for publication in BMC Urology.

Yours sincerely

J. Busch
S. Hinz

Reviewer's report #1
Version: 2 Date: 14 March 2012
Reviewer: Philippe Spiess
Reviewer's report:
The authors have addressed all of the reviewer comments and the manuscript is suitable for publication at this time.
Reviewer's report #2
Version: 2 Date: 28 March 2012
Reviewer: Wade Sexton

Reviewer's report:
Please refer to the original review which details the many confounding factors related to the attempts to compare these patient groups. The authors should emphasize in the discussion that the two patient groups were not comparable and this is a descriptive series of patients undergoing postchemotherapy RPLND for metastatic testis cancer. Patients were managed in an inhomogeneous fashion. Some of the surgical procedures were not performed according to established treatment guidelines.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests

Reply by Busch et al.: Thank You for Your additional remarks. We extensively addressed Your previous remarks in the previous revision. In the current version of our manuscript we clearly highlight the issue of confounding factors, imbalanced groups and limited drawbacks of our study. We changed the title, we changed the background part of the abstract, we changed the discussion section to underline the importance of this issue emphasizing the partly inhomogeneous management of patients and the descriptive aspect of our series. The discussion section focusing on this issue is marked in yellow. Additionally, we extensively corrected language aspects. At last we cannot enlarge the O-PCLND group and thereby improve the quality of the data.