Dear Editor

We submit our revised manuscript entitled "**HDAC Inhibitor Chidamide and PD-1 Blockade Combination in Diffuse Large B-cell Lymphoma Progressing after CD19-targeting CAR-T Therapy**" (manuscript ID "72745") to your journal for consideration.
The manuscript has been revised according to your and the reviewer's recommendations. The manuscript has not been published previously and acknowledged contributors have read and approved the manuscript.

Please see our response to the questions you proposed in this letter. We have marked yellow in the place that we have changed.

Thank you for your time and support.

Our best regards,

Wenbin Qian.
Department of Hematology (Cancer Institute, Key Laboratory of Cancer Prevention and Intervention, China National Ministry of Education, Key Laboratory of Molecular Biology in Medical Sciences, Zhejiang Province, China), The Second Affiliated Hospital, Zhejiang University School of Medicine.
88# Jiefang Road,
Hangzhou 310009, People's Republic of China.
Email: qianwb@zju.edu.cn
Tel: 86-571-89713674

Revision discussion

Reviewer 1:

It is my pleasure to review your valuable case report as a reviewer. I have some comments on your report. Please check and reconsider those.

1. You should add your accreditation number or ID at IRB approval.

Response – Sorry for this negligence. We have added the accreditation number at IRB approval in the manuscript（Page 1）, and we have uploaded the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board's official approval to the system.

2. You should add the number of cases in Figures 1 and 2.

Response – We greatly appreciate the suggestion from the Reviewer. We added the other 3 patients who had no curative effect in Figure 1 (Page 5). However, figure 2 showed the OS of the whole 7 patients. Therefore, we could not add the number of cases in Figure 2.

3. Figure 3, swimmers plots, patients 7 showed PD, but you wrote, Response ongoing. It looks at conflicts among the efficacy and patient outcome. Please check and revise understandable.

Response – We apologize for this error and we have revised it (Page 4).

Reviewer 2:

In general, the paper is well written. The title and introduction are adequate.

1. The authors should add data concerning manufacturers of chidamide and sintilimab.

Response – Sorry for this negligence. We have added the data about the manufacturers of Chidamide and Sintilimab (Page 3).

2. The paper can be better illustrated. Perhaps showing PET-CT scans before and during the combined treatment in one of the patients.

Response – We greatly appreciate the suggestion from the Reviewer. We have added Figure 4 to show the PET-CT scans before and during the combined treatment in patient 3 (Page 6).

3. Please explain how it is possimle that mPFS is shorten than mOS

Response – We apologize for this error. Because 3 patients had no effect from the combined treatment, we calculated the PFS of the other 4 patients. However, we calculated the OS of the whole 7 patients. Therefore, the mOS is shorten than mPFS. Now, we have calculated the PFS of all the 7 patients, and the corrected mPFS is only 4 months, which is shorten than mOS (6 months) (Page 4 and Page 5).

Reviewer 3:

The paper describes a small series of patients receiving chidamide combined with sintilimabe for DLBCL patients progressing after CD19-targeting CAR-T therapy with relatively favorable results. No comments

Response – Thanks for the reviewer's reading.