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Reviewer’s report:

This is a thorough systematic review and followed by a carefully conducted meta-analysis, with results describe in a well written report.

I have only a few suggestions:

(1) Page 7, lines 2-6: the authors indicate that cases and controls were matched on cryptorchidism and age; however they were not matched on cryptorchidism. The authors appear to appreciate this, because entries about this information in Table 2 are correct; I suggest revising the text accordingly.

(2) Figure 2a: I suggest that authors describe (in results section) heterogeneity identified in analysis leading to these results, and comment (in discussion) on likely source thereof.

(3) Additional file 2, item 9: Cases who participated in the Trabert study were not from a registry of sorts, but rather a series of men with this diagnosis seen at a major medical center; please correct.

(4) Additional file 2, item 9: Cases who participated in the Lacson study were not from a registry of sorts, but rather from the Los Angeles Cancer Surveillance Program, which is a population-based cancer registry that is part of the SEER network: please correct.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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