

Dear reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments on our manuscript entitled "Spermatocytic tumor: a rare case report and review of the literature" (ID: 70330). Those comments are very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to other research. We have studied the comments carefully and made corrections which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections are in the manuscript and the responds to the reviewers' comments are as follows (the replies are highlighted in blue).

Replies to the reviewers' comments:

1. Page 3: "Microscopy revealed a pseudo-glandular appearance of the tumor tissue" : specify what were the fixative and the staining used?

Fixative and dyeing method have been added in line10 / page5.

2. Page 4: "Immunohistochemical staining indicated ..." : Specify what was the immunohistochemical method used (see my comments of figure 3)

This item has been added in line22 / page5.

3. References: Check the references, and verify their presentation in the list according to the standards of the journal.

The references have been edit by auto-analyser and meet the standards of Journal.

4. Figures

Page 11, figure 2: Put a scalebar on each picture. Specify the staining.

We have added a scalebar on each picture and listed the dyeing methods.

Page 12, figure 3:

- Add a scalebar on each picture.

We have added a scalebar on each picture.

- Specify the method used for immunohistochemical study: direct? Indirect? In the last case, what was the second antibody used?

This item has been added in line22 / page5.

- Did the authors used a staining involving enzymatic reactions (peroxidase or other)? And, in this case, what was the chromogen used? (DAB? Other?)

This item has been added in line22 / page5.

Once again, thank you very much for your constructive comments and suggestions which would help us to improve the quality of the paper.

Kind regards,

Meiling Hao

E-mail address: 15632495450@163.com

Corresponding author : Chunhui Li

E-mail address: chli612@126.com

Dear science editor:

Thank you for your letter and comments on our manuscript entitled “Spermatocytic tumor: a rare case report and review of the literature” (ID: 70330). Those comments are very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to other research. We have studied the comments carefully and made corrections which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections are in the manuscript and the responds to the science editor comments are as follows (the replies are highlighted in blue).

Replies to the science editor’ comments:

1. Page 3: “Microscopy revealed a pseudo-glandular appearance of the tumor tissue” : specify what were the fixative and the staining used?

Fixative and dyeing method have been added in line10 / page5.

2. Page 4: “ Immunohistochemical staining indicated ... ” : Specify what was the immunohistochemical method used (see my comments of figure 3)

This item has been added in line22 / page5.

3. References: Check the references, and verify their presentation in the list according to the standards of the journal.

The references have been edit by auto-analyser and meet the standards of Journal.

4. Figures

Page 11, figure 2: Put a scalebar on each picture. Specify the staining.

We have added a scalebar on each picture and listed the dyeing methods

Page 12, figure 3:

- Add a scalebar on each picture.

We have added a scalebar on each picture.

- Specify the method used for immunohistochemical study: direct? Indirect? In the last case, what was the second antibody used?

This item has been added in line22 / page5.

- Did the authors used a staining involving enzymatic reactions (peroxidase or other)? And, in this case, what was the chromogen used? (DAB? Other?)

This item has been added in line22 / page5.

- Discuss the immunohistochemistry challenge for this tumor in Discussion section, especially Ki67 marker.

This item has been added in line27 / page6.

- Recently, spermatocytic tumour is adopted as a replacement for spermatocytic seminoma according to World Health Organization (WHO) classification

We have replaced the “spermatocytic seminoma” in the article with “spermatocytic tumour”.

- "In summary, we reported a typical case of seminoma" Is it a typical case for seminoma? or spermatocytic tumor?

This is a clerical error. It should be “spermatocytic tumor”.

Once again, thank you very much for your constructive comments and suggestions which would

help us to improve the quality of the paper.

Kind regards,

Meiling Hao

E-mail address: 15632495450@163.com

Corresponding author : Chunhui Li

E-mail address: chli612@126.com