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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

as requested by reviewers, the manuscript has been revised on the basis of their suggestions and corrections.

Here we report all the answers to the Reviewers

Reviewer#1

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) “Localisation” is spelled wrong through the manuscript.
2) Please note if the patient sought any medical treatment for the lesion during his (3) year history.
3) Being that schwannomas need to be surgically removed, what is the use of the MRI/CT scan to determine if it is extratesticular? How does it change your management?
4) Please note if lactate dehydrogenase was tested for?
5) A table is necessary to sum up and make the information more understandable that you found in the literature.
6) Information on a “plan” for follow up is needed or thoughts on what could be considered appropriate follow up for this unusual case.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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.
Answers to Reviewer#1:

1) The term “localisation” has been carefully reviewed through the manuscript
2) No. The patient did not seek any specific treatment due to the absence of pain symptoms.
3) In the few experiences reported in Literature and discussed in our paper, the MRI especially resulted capable to better define the extratesticular localisation of the mass, allowing the surgeons in case of easy cleavage to spare the testis.
4) The lactate dehydrogenase was not tested for its not specific value. Furthermore, in all the papers reported on this topic and discussed, none case showed altered values of testicular tumor markers.
5) The table requested has been provided (Table 1) and it has also been highlighted in the text.
6) It is hard to establish a specific follow-up plan considering the limited number of cases reported in literature. In case of benign lesions completely removed we suggest clinical post-operative evaluation at 6 and 12 months. Differently, in case of histopathological suspicious or clear evidence of malignancy, a MRI after 6 months from surgery should be proposed and further diagnostic tools and therapy should be based on the outcome. This concept has been reported in the conclusions.

As suggested, language correction has been made to the final text file.

Reviewer#2

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

A. The following references, which represent very early reports of testicular nerve sheath tumors were not incorporated by the authors in their review. They authors are advised to do so.


Introduction section.

“Scrotal localisation of schwannoma is rare, but has been the occasional subject of reports in the literature” This needs to be referenced.

B. The following should be revised and addressed in the Discussion section.

1) 2nd paragraph line 1, please revise as follows:

The clinical history of the disease was similar in each of the previous reports that we examined (List all applicable references). Each of the subjects presented with a history of painless scrotal swelling, between a few months and 3 years, as in our case.

2) 2nd paragraph line 7 - “In previously reported cases, therefore, US, magnetic
resonance imaging (MRI), and CT have variously been used to arrive at more exact diagnoses.” Please list the references associated the reported cases mentioned.
C. In the reference section please correct reference # 6. The title of the article is missing.

----------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct): none
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore): none
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Answer to Reviewer#2

In the “Introduction” references related to the sentence were provided, as correctly requested.
A. The suggested references have been included in the final text file.
B. The two sentences were addressed in the “Discussion” paragraph and revised as requested.
C. The title of the reference #6 has been correctly provided.