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Author’s response to reviews:

Dr. Ashwini Kumar Esnakula, Editor
Journal of Medical Case Reports
Stockholm, January 30th 2020

Dear Dr. Esnakula,

Please find attached our revised case report JMCR-D-19-00769R1 entitled “Metastatic malignant melanoma with neuroendocrine differentiation – report of a rare case and review of the literature” by Carl Christofer Juhlin, Jan Zedenius and Felix Haglund.

We would like to thank you and the two reviewers for considering our submission and for suggesting changes that we feel have strengthen the manuscript as a whole. Corrections to the main text have been carried out to fully meet the requirements and suggestions proposed by each referee. All changes to the main text have been marked up in yellow in the revised version.

The specific responses to the comments raised by the Editor as well as each referee follow below:

Editorial comment:

“Your manuscript "Metastatic malignant melanoma with neuroendocrine differentiation – report of a rare case and review of the literature" (JMCR-D-19-00769R1) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in Journal of Medical Case Reports, once you have carried out some essential revisions suggested by our reviewers.”

Reply: Thank you for these overall positive comments. We have revised our manuscript as according to the suggestions of both referees.
Reviewer 1:
“Overall, an interesting case report. well written and descriptive. Good flow. A few changes and suggestions are outlined below:”
Reply: Thank you for your overall positive comments and constructive suggestions.

Abstract:
pg 3, line 19(35) - substitute ":" (colon) with comma ","
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

pg 3, line 22 (36) - expand "INSM1" - its the first time it is being described and its not a commonly used antibody
Reply: Abbreviations for INSM1 and ISLET1 have been expanded.
Keywords: consider using carcinoma of unknown primary instead of/or in addition to neuroendocrine cancer
Reply: The suggested keyword has been added to the existing ones.

Case Presentation:
Pg 6, line 5 (82): spelling correction "polycythemia"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 6, line 10 (84): suggest expanding abbrevations "CT", since it is the first time it is being used
Reply: The abbreviation has been spelled out in full.

Pg 6, line 17 (87): suggest substitution of "costa 8" with either 8th rib or costal margin of the 8th rib as appropriate
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 6, line 22 (89): consider change to " 10mm large lesion in the left adrenal gland". Did this nodule increase in size between that time? If so, please indicate so.
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript. The nodule was stationary and did not increase in size. This information has now been added.

Pg 6, line 27 (91): consider change from "To conclude" to "To summarize"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 6, line 31 (93): suggest change from "core needle biopsy towards" to "core needle biopsy of the chest wall..."
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 6, line 34 (94): suggest change from "was put forward" to "was rendered"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 6, line 36 (95): Suggest change from "at our tertiary unit" to "to our tertiary unit".
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 6, line 41-44 (97-98): consider change to " round to slightly polygonal nuclei, focally pleomorphic....". was any nucleoli or pigment detected in this biopsy? please clarify.
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript. No prominent nucleoli or cytoplasmic pigmentation was noted. This information has now been added.
Pg 7, line 2-3(106): Insert "was" .., but was strongly positive for Vimentin.
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 7, line 4-19 (107-113): consider making this into 2 sentences. suggest : Scattered tumor cells were positive for Cytokeratin Oscar. The tumor cells were negative for ......"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 7, Line 39 (121): consider change from "ordered" to "performed"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 7, line 51 (125-126): suggest change from "radiation towards the pelvis" to "radiation directed at the pelvis..."
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 7, line 56-58 (128-129): suggest paraphrasing, histological evaluation of material decalcified by formic acid and microwave treatment revealed...."
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 8, line 1 (130) : consider change from "infiltration of a nest-forming tumor" to "infiltration by a nest-forming tumor"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 8, line 25 (140): suggest change to "The patient subsequently developed bilateral...
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 8, line 29 (142): suggest change from "lobular pneumonia" to "lobar pneumonia"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 8, line 34 (144): consider substituting "suboptimal" instead of "poorer"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 9, line 24 (156): clarify clinical material - does this refer to published literature or manufacturer's data/research ?
Reply: The term refers to previous publications, this has now been clarified.

Pg 9, line 43 (163): suggest using either "putting forward a diagnosis" OR "rendering a diagnosis"
Reply: The latter suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 9, line 45 (164): consider substituting "suboptimal" instead of "poorer"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Pg 9, line 55 (169): please expand H & E, has not been used previously in the body of the manuscript
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.
pg 10, line 2 (172): remove "s" from immunostainings - use "immunostaining"
Reply: We changed the term to “immunostaining results”.

Pg 10, line 28 (182): consider change from " general lack of descriptions" to "lack of published literature"
Reply: The suggested change has been implemented in the revised version of this manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

I reviewed JMCR-D-19-00769R1 manuscript for content and style. I strongly recommend that this manuscript is selected for publication, as it is well-written and addresses a pertinent subject matter for practicing anatomic pathologists. I find it free of typographical errors. I suggest that authors consider incorporating references PMID: 22325460 and PMID: 23260325 in the introduction. I suggest that authors consider reference https://www.mdanderson.org/content/dam/mdanderson/documents/for-physicians/algorithms/cancer-treatment/ca-treatment-unknown-primary-web-algorithm.pdf in the discussion.

Reply: We thank the referee for these positive remarks. Both references were implemented at appropriate sections in the revised manuscript as suggested, as well as the MD Anderson algorithm regarding cancers of unknown primary.

We again thank the referees for improving our manuscript substantially. We hope that the Editor and reviewers find the above-suggested changes are in line with their intentions and will find our manuscript of sufficient quality to warrant publication.

Best regards,

Carl Christofer Juhlin, MD, Associate Professor
Dept. of Oncology-Pathology, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden