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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Dr. Edmunds,

Thank you for your kind decision and the reviewer’s comments. We have accordingly revised the manuscript. Following is a point to point response to the reviewer’s comments.

**REVIEWER**

Comments and answers:

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. "The period from diagnosis until the present is 36 to 48 months" . It is recommended to be rephrased to : " the follow-up period from diagnosis was 36 to 48 months".

   Answer: We corrected it as suggested in the materials and methods section from line 17 to 18 of page 5.

2." A proteomic data set reported by Adam et al (2002) was used to classify the samples in this study. The data set consisted of SELDI TOF MS spectra from 207 samples which was generated with the WCX2 chip. Ten microliters.....". It is recommended to be rephrased to: " The protocol reported by Adam et al (2002) which was used to classify SELDI TOF MS spectra from 207 samples, was followed. In brief, 10 microliters....".

   Answer: We corrected it as suggested in the materials and methods section from line 8 to 9 of page 6.

3. "The chips were contained in a bioprocessor" better rephrase to "the chips were placed in a bioprocessor".

   Answer: We corrected it as suggested in the materials and methods section from line 18 to 19 of page 6.
4. "Specificity was calculated as the ratio of the number of non relapse....good prognosis samples or non relapse samples" The word "respectively" should be added in the end of this sentence.

Answer: We added it as suggested in the materials and methods section in line 29 of page 7.

5. "..Figure 1 illustrateS" (illustrates)

Answer: We corrected it as suggested in the results section in line 27 of page 9.

6. "Patients with an IPI of 0-2 were anticipated as patients with a good prognosis.." The word "anticipated" may be replaced with the word "considered".

Answer: We replaced the word “anticipitated” with the word “considered” in the results section from line 13 to 14 of page 11.

7. "The limitations do not inhibit of the application.." The word "of" should be deleted i.e "the limitations do not inhibit the application".

Answer: We deleted the word “of” in the discussion section in line 17 of page 15.

8. Tables 1-3: It is recommended to add the sentence " Mean and SD refer to the peak intensities".

Answer: We added the sentence in Tables 1-3.

9. Table 4: "The sensitivity of the SELDI marker pattern in DLBCL patients with different stages" may be rephrased to "the sensitivity of the SELDI marker pattern in detecting different DLBCL stages"

Answer: We corrected it as suggested it in the Table 4.

In additional, we have made the revision conform to the journal style.

We hope you will find the revised manuscript acceptable for publication in BMC Cancer.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Wenqi Jiang, M.D.
Professor
Department of Medical Oncology, Cancer Center, Sun Yet-sen University,
651 DongFeng East Road, Guangzhou, P. R. China. 510060
Tel: 86(20)87343352
Fax: 86(20)87343392
E-mail: wqjiang@yahoo.com and wqjiang@mail.sysu.edu.cn