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Dear Sir/Madam,

We revised our manuscript according to the reviewers' comments and we resubmit it.

Specifically, in accordance with Dr's Alireza Khatami comments:

A. General comments.

I. Title:
We have omitted the statement "Report of a rare case and short review of the literature" from the title.

II. Degrees and e-mail addresses of the authors have been stated.

III. Abstract:
(1) At the line 3 of the background, "appearance can occur but are extremely rare" has been replaced with "cases have been reported".
(2) On the first line of the third paragraph, "immunoistochemical" has been changed to "immunohistochemical". Also, on the line 4 of the third paragraph "radiological" has been changed to "imaging".
(3) On the third line of the third paragraph, before PCR, the complete name of this abbreviation (i.e. polymerase chain reaction) has been mentioned.
(4) The abstract has been structured into the following sections: introduction, case presentation, conclusion.

IV. Introduction:
(1) The word "very" from the sixth line of the first paragraph has been omitted.
(2) On the first line of the second paragraph, statement: "is a rare neoplasm presenting" has been changed to "presents".
(3) On the line 4 of the second paragraph "southern and eastern ..." has been changed to "Southern and Eastern ..."

V. Case presentation:

(1) The size of the lesion has been mentioned. “25-30 mm in diameter”

(2) On the line 5 of the first paragraph, the sentence: “The lesion presented characteristics clinically resembling ..." has been replaced with: "Clinically, the lesion resembled...".

(3) On the first line of the second paragraph, "Istologic" has been changed to "Histologic".

VI. Discussion:

(1) On the first line of the second paragraph of the first page of this section, the statement: "Kaposi's sarcoma is a lesion possessing..." has been changed to "KS lesions have..."

(2) On the line three of the same paragraph "Its emergence ..." has been changed to "Emergence of KS ..."

(3) On the line 4 of the same paragraph, "in that" has been changed to "because".

(4) On the line 3 of the third paragraph of the same page, we have not repeated the whole statement "Human herpes virus type 8". We have only mentioned the abbreviation "HHV-8".

(5) On the line 7 of the first paragraph of the second page of the discussion section, "Kaposi's disease" has been replaced with "KS".

(6) On the line 8 of the same paragraph, full name of the abbreviations "vMIP, vIL8R and vIL6" have been provided before each abbreviation: viral monocyte
inflammatory protein (vMIP), viral interleukin-8 receptor (vIL8R) and viral interleukin 6 (vIL6).

VII. Conclusion.
On the first line of the first paragraph, "Kaposi's sarcoma" has been changed to "KS".

VIII. References.
Format of the references has been re-checked.

B. Revisions necessary for publication:
I. References for the first two paragraphs of the discussion sections have been provided.

II. The contribution of the "patient's origin" to the mislead is unfortunately a matter of poor quality of written English. The sentence “The lesion’s clinical presentation, its location, the otherwise normal skin, as well as the lack of any predisposing factors, besides the patient’s origin, were misleading” has been changed to: “The lesion’s clinical presentation, its location, the otherwise normal skin, as well as the lack of any predisposing factors, with the exception of the patient’s origin, were misleading. When we used the word "besides", we meant to state “except”.

III. On the line 4 of the first paragraph of the second page of the discussion, it has been mentioned that "the role of excisional biopsy...” was emphasized. In this revised manuscript we explain that: “… the reason for performing a wide local excision is that the lesion was regarded as squamous cell carcinoma, for which standard surgical excision is the preferred treatment. If we had considered the possibility of KS, we would have chosen an incisional biopsy
to determine the tumor histology. Excisional biopsy would not have been the preferable method because the lesion was too large to anticipate primary closure.”

IV. We have used reference for the third paragraph of the same page.

V. Additional references have been provided in accordance with the reviewers’ detailed comments. There are no more than 15 references in the revised manuscript, as it is suggested in “Instructions for JMC authors”.

According to Dr’s Mark Russell comments:

1. KS of the hand not related to HIV infection has been described previously in the literature. However, since “its sporadic presentation is rare” and “… it is a rare occurrence in females”, we think that this is an unusual presentation of a disease. This comment was not amenable to any changes.

2. The clinical differential of this lesion would include other tumors including AFX, melanoma, epithelioid sarcoma, Merkel cell carcinoma, DFSP, vascular tumors (e.g. hemangiopericytoma), other sarcomas, etc., indeed. However, we consider that the clinical picture of the described lesion (…6-month history of a slowly evolving, asymptomatic, raised, slightly pigmented skin lesion) was typical of squamous cell carcinoma. This is supported by:

Vasconez H, Ferguson R Jr, Vasconez L: Plastic & Reconstructive surgery. In Current Surgical Diagnosis & Treatment. 12th edition. Edited by Doherty GM and Way LW. New York: Lange Medical Books/McGraw Hill; 2006: 1231. (…It may present as a slowly growing, locally invasive lesion..., ....as a small, firm erythematous plaque or nodule..., ....it becomes raised...). Thus, we
think that the clinical picture supports our inference that the lesion mimicks mainly squamous cell carcinoma.

3. Figure 2 reference has been moved up to the preceeding sentence.

4. Figure 3 has been omitted.

5. In the introduction paragraph, 5th sentence, we have put "common" before neoplasm.

6. In the Case Presentation section, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, we have put an "H" on the first word.

7. All abbreviations have been identified with a key.

8. The 8th paragraph in the Discussion section was only one sentence and it has been incorporated in the next paragraph.

9. In the Discussion section, 11th paragraph, 2nd sentence, "suffer from" has been replaced with "have". In the next sentence, "Patients requiring" has been replaced with "Some patients require" and then "can be easily identified" has been eliminated.

10. Discussion section, 12th paragraph was confusing and did not flow well with paragraph 11. The sequence of these paragraphs has been changed in order to be more understandable.

11. Discussion section, paragraph 13, first sentence was confusing and it has been omitted.

According to the reviewers’ comments we have made some language corrections in order to improve the quality of written English.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Best regards,

Dr Chr. Kosmidis.