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Dear Mr. Josefino M. Rodis,

We resubmit our manuscript “Primary cerebral low-grade B-cell lymphoma, monoclonal immunoglobulin deposition disease, cerebral light chain deposition disease and "aggregoma": an update on classification and diagnosis” after correction for reevaluation.

As advised by the editorial board, the manuscript was edited by a professional editing service; an editorial certificate from the editing service was attached. Further, we addressed the reviewers’ comments in a point-by-point response. We hope, our revision will satisfy the editorial board.

Yours sincerely,

Marco Skardelly

Correction with regard to reviewer Mara Popovic

Major revisions:

1. The reference was removed. The insertion was not intended—it was a mistake.
2. We agree with the concerns of the reviewer; thus, we excluded the case report of Cachia from the document.
3. The text passage was adapted with regard to the reviewer’s concerns.
4. The localization of the tumor was specified in the table and the main text: Subcortical parieto-insular lobe and basal ganglia.
5. The designation was corrected from amyloidoma to amyloidosis.
6. The case of Popovic et al. (ref. 20) was adapted according to the reviewer’s recommendation.
Minor revisions:
1. Figure 5 was adapted to the reviewer’s suggestion.
2. Because the corrected manuscript was not provided by the reviewer, we could not take into account those minor suggestions.

Correction with regard to reviewer Jacoline E C Bromberg
We do not agree with the reviewer’s opinion regarding the scientific value of this article. In this case report, we present the first tumoral presentation (aggregoma) of LCDD. Moreover, we provide the first comprehensive summary of this complex and unknown disease.

The reviewer criticized in Figure 5 that
1. *The acronyms are not explained in the legend:* All acronyms are explained in the legend.
2. *It is not clear why the subcategories are made and where the numbers in figure 5 come from:* Both pieces of information are available in the manuscript. Figure 5 is only a visualization of the described information and relationships in the manuscript.

The reviewer recommends to
1. *Shorten the paper:* The aim of this report was to present this rare disease and to provide a comprehensive overview concerning this topic. A shortening of the paper would compromise the quality of the case report or the quality of the review of the topic. If the shortening of the manuscript is the editorial board’s requirement, we can do that.
2. *Present the table in the main document:* The table was already meant to be part of the document.
3. *Clarify the classification:* the classification is already described in the main document.