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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: None.

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)
      - Main symptoms of the patient
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

   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.

   d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
      - Diagnostic methods
      - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
      - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

   e. Types and mechanism of intervention

   f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits
Comments: All information were well-written.

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?
   Comments: see additional 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

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

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
   Comments: see additional comments.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?
   I appreciate you asking me to review this manuscript, "A case report of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma involving Meckel's cave masquerading as biopsy-negative giant cell arteritis." This case is instructive and well-written. I have several comments for the manuscript.

   Major points.
   1. The novelty of this case is limited.
      Although this case is cautionary, there are several case reports illustrating that lymphoma mimicked giant cell arteritis. The authors should review previous cases and compare them with this case.

   2. The authors should discuss why the first local MRI was interpreted as normal.
      Although the authors proposed MRI of the brain should be obtained, MRI of the brain was performed in this case but interpreted as normal. Is this finding of the local MRI of brain difficult to be detected? If the local primary provider found the abnormal finding of MRI, the unnecessary treatment would be avoided. The authors should comment why this finding was easily missed.

   3. The authors also should discuss relevant differential diagnoses of the finding of MRI.
      Doctors should know differential diagnoses to plan a diagnostic strategy before conducting PET-CT.

   4. If the authors examine soluble IL-2 receptor before chemotherapy, please specify it.

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

   An article of limited interest

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