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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments: no ethical concerns

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

a. The relevant patient information, including:

   - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
   - Main symptoms of the patient
   - Medical, family and psychosocial history
   - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

b. The relevant physical examination findings
c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:

- Diagnostic methods
- Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
- Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: adequate information provided

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: yes

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: yes

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: no
Your report is comprehensive and yet the end result appears to be failure. You do not state what happened to the patient so we assume the cancers were not eradicated.

What you did was limited by your knowledge and bad advice.

The European association of urology, recommend in case of distant recurrence to offer chemotherapy as the first option, and consider metastasectomy in case of unique metastasis site of unique metastasis site.

You did not complain about the poor advice and I urge you to tell these august bodies that doing what they recommend does not work. Unless you make these conclusions the belief in dangerous poisons being able to cure will persist. Chemotherapy is trying to selectively kill cells. It does not work. You should make this clear in your report.

The diagnosis was inadequate. Again, you can only work with the tools available so at least admit the inadequacy. The distinguishing feature of cancer tissue is its permittivity. Alas, oncologists are not yet using this method.

It would have been interesting to learn more about the patient. There are three stages in curing cancer: stop the cancer, repair the damage caused by the cancer and find out what led to the failure of the immune system to remove the incipient cancers in the beginning.

Was he a smoker or worrier? Did he exercise enough? What was his diet? His identity could still be protected when including the additional information in the report.
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