

Dear Reviewer,

First of all, thank you very much for your valuable comments on our article. We revised and uploaded the article based on the comments. We upload images and tables as files. Secondly, we will respond one-on-one to your valuable revision comments:

**1. The authors should make a literature review (add a table) and state the exact number of cases of primary testicular neuroendocrine tumors reported in the literature.**

We have added tables to the manuscript in accordance with comments, as well as references to the exact number of reported primary neuroendocrine tumor cases.

**2.The authors should use the latest WHO classification of testicular tumors and use the latest grading system of neuroendocrine tumors**

We used the latest WHO testicular classification and the latest WHO grading system for neuroendocrine tumors in the original text as requested.

**3.Figures 4 and 5 are out of focus. They must be changed by higher quality figures .**

In response to the problem of blurred pictures, we re-uploaded the original pictures in the form of files as required.

**4.The references are not current. The authors must add more recent references**

We re-cited the most recent literature as requested by the reviewers.

**5.The style, language and grammar are not accurate enough**

For language expression, grammar and other issues, we invite professional institutions to edit and polish the manuscript, and strive to make the language smooth and accurate.。

**6. Right at the beginning of the introduction I believe that the authors mean "Neuroendocrine Tumors (NETs)" and not "Neuroendocrine Tumor (NETs)".**

It was a language spelling error and we have corrected it.

**7. Stay in the introduction, many of the sentences are without references. Please reference all phrases**

We have referenced all statements as requested

**8. In the "Chief complaints" section, I suggest replacing "was diagnosed" with "was admitted".**

We have reworked the main complaint section as requested to make the language more concise and clear.

**9. The "History of present illness" section is not well done in the article and I suggest a reformulation of it. As it is written, I cannot form the chronological history in my head, nor understand under what conditions the patient arrived at the service. With that long history (7 yrs) he was admitted to the ED? Was asked about the reason for the delay in medical care? How was the initial management of the patient and his path through the health service? Has there been any history analyzed and other previous passages by doctors for the same reason? Also, the CT and MRI exams are mentioned in this section but in my understanding they were performed after admission and therefore should not be in this section. If they were carried out before admission and in fact they are a history, they must be chronologically linked and referenced to the time of admission, that is, describe how many days after admission they were carried out.**

Regarding the questions raised by the reviewers, according to the requirements, we have revised the current medical history, and described the patient's diagnosis and treatment process in chronological order, as well as the specific examination and treatment after visiting our hospital. The specific content is as shown in the original text.

**10.I suggest that the authors insert arrows in the images that point to the findings. For the results of laboratory tests, I suggest that they be placed in a table. In addition, I believe that routine laboratory tests were carried out and are not reported, but should be for a better understanding of the case**

We marked the arrows on the pictures as required, and the lab inspections were organized in the form of tables, and these pictures and tables would be uploaded in the form of files.

**11.Add a little more about the clinical rationale involved and what the patient's journey was like from admission to final diagnosis and treatment. The way it is written gives the impression that the patient went straight to imaging and laboratory tests and there was no clinical reasoning behind it.**

The manuscript was revised in accordance with the reviewer's suggestions to make the patient's treatment process more clinically logical. The type of disease was considered through laboratory examinations and imaging examinations, and the final conclusions were drawn through pathological and immunohistochemical examinations.

**12.In the discussion review the sentences and word constructions, some are confusing and disconnected (example: "Two types of neuroendocrine tumors, carcinoid and neuroendocrine carcinoma, have been described.A new classification method for digestive system tumors of WHO in 2010").**

For the questions raised by the reviewers, we have revised the controversial expressions in the paragraphs to make the expression of the article more fluent.

**13. In the discussion, differential diagnosis and treatment and prognosis sessions, many of the sentences, as well as in the introduction, are without references. Please reference.**

The Discussion, Diagnosis, and Differential Diagnosis sections were referenced to the latest literature as requested.

**14.In the "Treatment and prognosis" section, I believe the authors mean "Our patient..." and not "Our patients received radical orchiectomy, radiofrequency ablation...". Again, I suggest a careful review to prevent errors like this from being present in the article.**

We have re-edited the "Treatment and prognosis" section, organized it to make the language more fluent, and the revised manuscript will be re-uploaded.

Based on the comments of the cross-check report, we have re-revised the repeated parts of the manuscript, which will be uploaded in the form of files later. Please edit and review to see if there are still areas that need to be revised. I hope you can give valuable revision suggestions. We hope After the final version of the manuscript is confirmed, a professional language editing agency will be invited to modify the language expression and upload a new language certificate to make the expression of the article more rigorous and scientific.

Finally, thank you again for your contribution to our manuscript and hope that our research will be published in your journal!

Best regards,

xiaotong960123@163.com