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Reviewer's report:

The paper is interesting but in my opinion the conclusions are not sufficiently supported by the methods. First of all, and the authors confirm too, this is a retrospective analysis with a lot of bias:
why do exclude deaths non tumor related?

why do exclude those who died within 30 days?

It is not possible to produce a normogram with these data, I think that it could be useful to distinct patients according to treatment and realise a nomogram according to treatment. Probably it is important to know if patients submitted to surgery has a better outcome than other (as supposed by authors) or the outcome of those treated with chemotherapy alone and so on.
It is clear that mortality is superior in the first two years but it is not clear that in the following years what is due. Usually not for lymphoma but for complications.
The authors can not use the term 'metastases' in a lymphoproliferative disease it is conceptually wrong.
Line 21-22 page 5 'active treatment.....' after two years I think that an active follow-up is more important than a therapy.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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