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Reviewer's report:

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.

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 - ethnic background of patient not given and this is important here

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

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

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.

**Level of interest**
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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