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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Reviewer #1

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic? YES Yes/No

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript. NO

Dear reviewer

I have included consent from her proxy/power of attorney, who is her daughter.

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature? YES Yes/No

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify. a. The relevant patient information, including: - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity) YES - Main symptoms of the patient YES - Medical, family and psychosocial history.
I have included relevant medical, family and psychosocial history.

Relevant past interventions and their outcomes NO

This has been incorporated

The relevant physical examination findings; NO

This has been incorporated

Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month. YES

d. Diagnostic assessments, including: - Diagnostic methods YES –

e. Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural) YES –

f. Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable YES

g. Types and mechanism of intervention YES

h. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits YES Comments:

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented? NEEDS MORE INFORMATION. Comments:

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below. YES Yes/No

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented? YES Comments:

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature? YES, but more information is needed for readers. Comments:

9. Additional comments for the author(s)? Thank you for submitting the case.
These are my thoughts about this case.

1. We should include FLIPI score or IPI score for lymphomas for staging purposes.
   IPI score has been included

2. What was the LDH?
   This was incorporated

3. It appears the patient has B symptoms and in that case staging should be "B".
   This was corrected

4. ECOG Performance status should be included for elderly patients.
   This has been included.

5. Family history and Medication history should be included.
   We have included family history.

6. Was the patient taking Steroids? On/off or regularly for his pulmonary condition as steroids sometimes mask the diagnosis (either relapse or new presentation)
   We have added text stating that patient was not on steroids.

7. We should explain why we opted for a core biopsy instead of an excisional biopsy of the cervical LN when we suspected lymphoproliferative disorder as our suspected diagnosis?
   We incorporated an explanation for why a core was obtained

8. The cause of death should be explained and any post-mortem done?
   Post-mortem examination was not pursued given her advanced dementia and patient’s preferences

9. Your review of all cases in literature is appreciated and it is definitely helpful for readers.

Reviewer #2

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?
   Yes
2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments: The manuscript states that the patient gave consent, however, the patient was also suffering from dementia. I think the Journal would be sensible to check that consent from the patient was informed.

A consent has been incorporated

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.
   a. The relevant patient information, including:
      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity) - yes
      - Main symptoms of the patient - yes
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history - yes
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes - no - but not relevant to the case

   b. The relevant physical examination findings

   c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month. date of death in relationship to diagnosis could be clarified in the text - this has to be extrapolated from the Table

   We have made clear a correlation from her lymphoma diagnosis to the time of death.

   d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
      - not adequately explained - the exact histological diagnosis of the nodal biopsy should be clearly stated in the case presentation
      - Diagnostic methods
      - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
      - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

   e. Types and mechanism of intervention - adequately explained

   f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: see above - presumably the final review was at the patient's terminal illness
5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented? Comments: Probably but reviewing the cases present in the patient cohort many of these seem to come from Japanese authors - an ethnic bias to spontaneous lymphoma resolution is not discussed by the authors

Dear reviewer- this was excellent recommendation- we have incorporated this

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below. Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Yes Comments:

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature? Comments: Yes, this issue, is of interest to clinicians and the cohort study is also useful

9. Additional comments for the author(s)? Issues above require clarification, some of the grammar could be improved. I would suggest the authors re-read their proof and correct these e.g line 33 'that lymph node' instead of 'that the lymph node'. Similar instances through the text that need correcting.

This has been corrected

3. Dear author, 1. Please add photos of histopathology of the LN biopsy and any immunohistochemistry to increase the educational value of the report.

As requested, these are added.

4. Figure 2 is flow cytometry. Correct figure legends and text where it is incorrectly labeled as figure 3.

These have been corrected