

Peer Review File

Article Information: Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-20-1073>

Comment 1: This manuscript lacks actual work as a literature review.

For the mentioned 34 cases, what database is searched?

Besides, use a table to conclude the critical finding (places, clinical manifestation, ways to diagnose, therapy, follow up duration, outcome/prognosis) from these cases.

Then, discuss in the discussion regarding what you have found regarding the table/big picture.

Reply 1: We thank the reviewer for his/her detailed comment. Firstly, we conducted a literature search extensively on authenticated databases including PubMed/Medline, Embase, and Web of Science. MeSH terms 'Scrotum' and 'Lipoma' were used as searching strategy, obvious duplicates were removed. All in all, 34 results were found. According to this reviewer's advice, we should add a table to conclude the critical finding from these cases. So we performed a literature search again on the same databases, cases written in English and available for full texts were eligible. After comprehensive searching, we found that 9 cases were not published in English and 9 cases were not available for full text. Initially, 16 cases were included in the literature review, and we present the results in Table 1. (See page 5, line 89-92)

Secondly, we included all of the 16 cases reported in English with full texts, and added Table 1 to show the critical finding (places, clinical manifestation, ways to diagnose, therapy, follow-up, outcome/prognosis) from these cases as advised. (See page 16-17, Table 1)

Finally, we have discussed our findings on the included cases in the discussion based on the Table 1.

Thank this reviewer again for this insightful advice. (See page 5, line 92-98; page 7, line 130-135)

Change in the text: See page 5, line 89-92; page 16-17, Table 1; page 5, line 92-98; page 7, line 130-135.

Comment 2: In the abstract, highlight what is unique of this case report.

Reply 2: Thank this reviewer for this advice. We described the unique of this case in the discussion and we were sorry that we omitted it in the abstract. So we have modified the abstract and added a sentence “Based on the literature review, very few cases of primary scrotal lipoma were reported in the scientific literature up to date, and this is the first report of bilateral primary scrotal lipoma along with multiple lipomas of the body. We presented this case as a rare phenomenon.” to illustrate the unique of our case report. We have highlighted it in yellow in the abstract as advised. (See page 2, line 36-39)

Change in the text: See page 2, line 36-39.

Comment 3: Draw a timeline to outline the whole procedure. Make sure present it in a time-based manner, and the timeline should stand alone.

Reply 3: We thank this reviewer for his/her suggestion of our manuscript. As he/she commented, we have completed a timeline in a time-based manner to outline the whole treatment procedure of the patient. (See page 15, Figure 3)

Change in the text: See page 15, Figure 3.

Comment 4: Add another paragraph to list both strengths and weakness of this manuscript.

Reply 4: We thank the reviewer for his/her careful reading of the manuscript. We have added another paragraph in the end of discussion to expound the strengths and weakness of our manuscript as advised. We do agree with this reviewer and think it is necessary. (See page 8, line 145-154)

Change in the text: See page 8, line 145-154.

Comment 5: The sentence 'Since first described by Livermore GR in 1948, only 34 cases of scrotal lipoma have been reported until now (6).' is not accurate. Correct with 'Since first described by Livermore GR in 1948 (6), only 34 cases of scrotal lipoma have been reported until now'. Check throughout the manuscript to avoid similar mistakes.

Reply 5: We thank the reviewer for his/her careful reading of the manuscript. As he/she commented, we've made that correction in our revised manuscript and thank this reviewer for pointing out our mistake. And we have checked the whole manuscript again and again to avoid such mistakes. (See page 5, line 96-97)

Change in the text: See page 5, line 96-97.

Comment 6: This manuscript needs English polish by a native speaker.

Reply 6: We are thankful for this reviewer's suggestion. We have invited two English native speakers of our college to help polish our manuscript. We revised our manuscript accordingly with updated content within the manuscript by using the red color to show the changes of the text.

Change in the text: We used the red color to show the changes of the revised manuscript.

Post-revision review

Comment 1: One last concern. I suggest add a practical take-home message in the abstract.

Reply 1: We thank the reviewer for his/her detailed comment. According to the last concern of the reviewer, we have added a practical take-home message in the abstract as that “Although primary scrotal lipoma is rare, clinicians should take it into account when encountering similar scrotal lesions and know the methods for diagnosis and how to make differential diagnosis with other diseases, which

is associated with the patient's treatment strategy and prognosis.” and highlight it in yellow. Thank this

reviewer again for this insightful advice. (See page 2-3, line 39-42)

Change in the text: See page 2-3, line 39-42.