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Reviewer's report:

Interesting report of an SFT found in the extra-pleural space.

Abstract: Your abstract background is poorly written and needs to be less repetitive. The abstract case presentation section you need to mention the follow up duration.

Case report:

1) What other GU sites have had SFT's and what were the outcomes therein?

2) When discussing your "scrotal approach", you are vague in your surgical description. Was it a midline raphe incision, was the mass adherent to Dartos or the testicle or completely separate. What were you surgical margins (did you excise wide or narrow, 1cm margins or no margins, did you need to sacrifice any vessels, was cautery used?). As this is a Urology publication, please be specific on your Urologic surgical approach so that future surgeons encountering this issue know what exact approach to follow.

3) In your background section you need to quote the papers where scrotal SFT's have been reported.

4) Case presentation line 39: "more to the right of the scrotum" is not a surgically necessary description. Can replace it for "non adherent".

5) Testis tumor markers were all normal. You did not mention LDH?

6) Page 4 line 7: "Connected firm tumors." Would recommend lobulated and contiguous as words. Try to use more medical terms to describe structures and appearances.

7) Page 4 line 39: "Patient is alive without tumor recurrence during ongoing follow up every 6 month". What does this mean. Does this mean we are only 6 months post resection and so far he has no tumor. If thats the case be specific as to how long he has been followed up (i.e 3 years post resection with semi-annual CT's...)

8) Page 6 line 26. "Malignant pathology have been described in about 20% of SFT". Any malignant potential in GU SFT?

9) Page 7 line 14. "6 month follow up with CT was conducted". Again does this mean he's only 6 months removed from his SFT? If so be specific. What have other reports done in terms of follow up. What study has the longest follow up and what did they use.
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