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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for sending us the review report of our manuscript.

The comments and suggestions made by the Reviewers allow us to improve the manuscript.

We hope this is sufficient for the manuscript to be accepted for publication in your prestigious Journal.

Sincerely,

July, 17th, Bari.

Luigi Vimercati
The authors of this article should be congratulated for the great review work carried out with the intention of highlighting the possible relationship between asbestos exposure and malignant mesothelioma of the testicular vaginal tunica.

Dear Reviewer, thank you for your kind congratulations, that recognize the extent of the revision work.


The duration of asbestos exposure is only recorded in 43 articles of the 212 reviewed (20.28%), with a range of exposure from 3 to 42 years. I consider these data should be reflected in the discussion of the article.

Thank you for your kind suggestion. I added in Discussion this sentence: “The duration of asbestos exposure is recorded in 108 articles of the 165 reviewed (65.45%). In these articles 50 ascertained the exposure (30.30%) while in 58 articles it was excluded (35.15%). The duration of exposure is between 4 - 50 years, for occupational exposures only the range is 4-40 years. For the new employment cases presented here the range is 3-23 years.”
The corrections are detailed below.

* PAGE 2, line 27-28: I recommend to change "…will need to analyze the same with analytical epidemiological studies..." for "…it is necessary to analyze the same variables in the epidemiological studies..."

* PAGE 2, line 46 and 49: I suggest to change "…tunica vaginalis testis…" for "…testicular vaginal tunica…"

* PAGE 3, line 10: to change "…in Rankin…” for "…by Rankin…” and "…in Kossow…” for "…by Kossov…”

* PAGE 3, line 38: to change "…recorded in the literature might…” for "…reported might…”

* PAGE 3, line 50: to delete "…of which…” after "…the cut-off date…”

* PAGE 3, line 52: to add "…and were…” like this: "…2018, and were identified…”

* PAGE 4, line 36-38: subtle changes in the first two lines of the Results like this: "Since in 1943 a confusing nomenclature arose and in 1945 Golden and Ash (18) introduced the term "adenomatoid tumours", De Klerk and Nime (185) reported in 1975 from…”

* PAGE 4, line 49: to change "…in table 1 are…” for "…in table 1 were…”

* PAGE 5, line 14 and 18: lack to explain the characteristics of the staining

* PAGE 5, line 29: to change "…exposure was…” for "….exposure had…”

* PAGE 5, line 48: to change "…during foeta…” for "….during fetal…”

* PAGE 5, line 51: to change "…tract is of…” for "….tract has…”

* PAGE 5, paragraph from line 42 to 58: in this paragraph, the origin of the endothelium hypothesis must be explained.

* PAGE 7, line 1: I suggest to change: "...microvilli are long and slender in complex formation..." for "...the microvilli are elongated and develop complexes..."

* PAGE 7, line 44: I recommend to delete "...that are radioincurable..."

* PAGE 9, line 9 and 16: to change the word "...familial..." for "...family..."

* PAGE 9, line 58: to delete "...for occupational-related compensation claim purposes..."

* PAGE 10, line 25: to add "...had asbestos exposure..." after "...(1943-2018)..." and before ".., must be..."
* The references number 5, 7, 10, 19, 20, 21, 31 and 191 have to use lowercase letters except the first letter that is capital

* I can not find the title of the references number 28, 29 and 30

* Figure 1: to change "...Gross examination..." for "...Microscopic examination..."

* Figure 2-3: I suggest to delete 2-3 and write only figure 2 and figure 3 in each image and to explain the staining

Thank you for your kind suggestion. I modified the manuscript according to all your suggested revisions.

Moreover:

* PAGE 5, line 14 and 18: lack to explain the characteristics of the staining

FIG.2 Case number 4. Microscopic examination, pseudopapillary epithelioid neoplastic proliferation wrapping around the testicular parenchyma. Diffuse immunopositivity for calretinin antigen (x 200).

FIG.3: Case number 4. Microscopic examination, pseudopapillary epithelioid neoplastic proliferation wrapping around the testicular parenchyma (H&E, X100).

* PAGE 5, paragraph from line 42 to 58: in this paragraph, the origin of the endothelium hypothesis must be explained.

I added in Discussion this sentence: “Early writers believed that this tumour had a lymphangiomatous origin because the predominance of labyrinthine channels lined by seemingly flat endothelial cells embedded in a reticular stroma, subsequent microscopic investigations excluded the endothelial origin due to the presence of vacuolated cuboidal and columnar cells. (42). “

* Figure 1: to change "...Gross examination..." for "...Microscopic examination..."

I changed "Gross examination" for “Macroscopic examination”