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Dear Editorial Review Board for The Journal of Medical Case Reports

We thank you for your thorough review of the submitted case reported entitled “A case report of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma involving Meckel’s cave masquerading as biopsy-negative giant cell arteritis” (JMCR-D-19-00543R1). We, the authors, have reviewed your comments and have amended the submission in accordance with the requests made. The accompanying documents include a revised manuscript with track changes as well as a final version with incorporated requests for changes.

Reviewer Comments with author response:
Reviewer Comment #1
The case report should include past medical, social, environmental, family and employment history
Author reply to comment #1
This has been added to the case description as noted in lines 61-65

Reviewer Comment #2
What medications was the patient receiving prior to diagnosis?
Author reply to Comment #2
Medication prior to diagnosis have been added as noted in line 62 – prednisone prior to diagnosis is commented on in the initial paragraphs.

Reviewer Comment #3
Did the patient smoke, and or consume alcohol?
Author reply to Comment #3
Additional detail on social and environmental history has been added as noted in lines 62-64

Reviewer Comment #4
Give detailed physical and neurological examination on admission
Author reply to Comment #4
Additional detail on physical and neurological examination on admission has been added as noted in lines 72-86.
Reviewer Comment #5
Give the doses of all medication that were given and their doses.
Author reply to Comment #5
Additional detail of medications used have been provided as noted in lines 101-103 and 108.
Reviewer Comment #6
Give all results of laboratory findings (ie. CBC, liver, and renal functions, urinalysis and serology, etc).
Author reply to Comment #6
Additional detail of laboratory findings have been added as noted in lines 66-71.
Reviewer Comment #7
Give information about follow up for at least 6 months
Author reply to Comment #7
The follow-up provided included follow-up beyond 6 months but on review the author identified this was not clear as the mentioned follow-up interval was “four months after 6 cycles.” Clarification was provided to include information that this follow-up was 4 months after the 4.5 months of treatment (i.e. 8.5 months after diagnosis).
Reviewer Comment #8
Add a paragraph at the beginning of the discussion that summarizes the case and describes what is unique in this case compared to what is available in the literature
Author reply to Comment #8
Additional paragraph was added as noted in lines 111-116.

Thank you for your continued review of this case report

We look forward to your re-review and decision.

Sincerely,

Matthew Samec, M.D.
samec.matthew@mayo.edu