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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected association between diseases or symptoms

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Please find below our comments and recommendations to the authors

1- The key words do not reflect sufficiently the interest of the case, i.e. although the immunohistochemistry has major diagnostic and prognosis value it was not included.

2- the case information should not be extensively presented in the introduction section to avoid repetitions since this belongs to the case presentation section.

3- The clinical examination was not very rich, and I believe that there are more interesting details to be included such the tumour characteristics, the type of lymphoma node, etc.

4- Some epidemiological information’s were not referenced.

5- The clinical and imaging differential diagnosis issues were not sufficiently
introduced and discussed.

6- The immunohistochemistry has to be extensively discussed since it is a major diagnostic tool and has the main role in delimiting the prognosis.

7- What was the evoked type of tumour through the initial ultrasound and before surgery?

8- Was there any metastatic site? If any, where was there localization?

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published