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Author's response to reviews: see over
Reviewer 3# The authors have not really incorporated any of my review comments into the methodology section of the paper, all the methodological points I raised in my review should be included in the method section, that is the reason only 2 TMA’s were used rather than 3 of 4, the number and types of tumours rejected at pathology review and why they were rejected as not being sarcomas, the issue of intratumoural lymphocyte heterogeneity and how they sorted this methodological issue out.

Our response: This is now included in the method section of the paper.

Reviewer 3# The authors tabulate the results of lymphocyte counts at tumour centres but do not further discuss these and do not undertake a multivariate analysis of lymphocyte counts with Cd20 at tumour centre, presumably because in this dataset there was no statistical effect on prognosis of Cd20 counts at tumour centre. This CONTRADICTS the findings of the authors' earlier article in PLOS1, there is no discussion of this AT ALL in the revised article. This really begs the question as to whether statistically the effect of Cd20 on prognosis may be just an example of random statistical error (Beta error), the p vale for tumour centre in univariate analysis is 0.88.

Our response: This is now included in the discussion.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to improve the revised manuscript. We hope this new revised manuscript will be acceptable for publication in BMC Clinical Pathology.