

Answering reviewers

Dear editor:

We have finished the revision of our manuscript “Burkitt-like lymphoma with 11q aberration confirmed by needle biopsy of the liver: A case report and review of literature” according to all reviewers’ and editorial office’s comments. The following is a point-by-point response. We hope that the revised version will satisfy your standard of publication.

REVIEWER REPORTS:

Reviewer #1:

Comment: In this study the authors present a case of Burkitt-like lymphoma with 11q aberration of the liver. This is an interesting presentation of a rare case with good illustrations. The following points should be considered: • This lymphoma is very rare and lacks the MYC rearrangement and carries an 11q-arm aberration with proximal gains and telomeric losses as stated by the authors. However recently further potential driver mutations were found in 27 genes involving BTG2, DDX3X, ETS1, EP300, and GNA13[1]. Those findings should be mentioned in the manuscript. 1. Gonzales-Farre B et al Haematologica. 2019 Sep; 104(9): 1822-1829. • BLL-11q has been unified as a provisional category in the revised World Health Organization (WHO) classification. At present its precise taxonomy is still controversial. It is not possible to draw a conclusion whether it presents as a particular variant of BL, diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) or a distinct form of high-grade B-cell lymphoma. This issue should be comprehensively presented in the discussion section.

Response: Thanks for your suggestions. We have added this reference and related findings in the DISCUSSION (Reference 16).

Comment: Although the manuscript gives information about recent cases, a

table that includes the demographical and pathological findings of previously reported cases should be presented to allow to better summarize the findings and to attract readers attention:

Response: Thanks for your suggestions. We have included a table (Table S1) to present the demographical and pathological findings in the reported cases.

Reviewer #2:

Comment: Minor language polishing is needed.

Response: We have used a professional native English editing service from MedE Editing Group (<http://meditorexpert.com>) to proofread the manuscript. An editorial certificate is attached.

Reviewer #3:

Comment: Please confirm this data: "It has been reported that prognosis of the tumor is good, most are completely resolved after BL standard chemotherapy, and the survival rate is 94.74% - 100%." is this the 5y survival rate or 1y?

Response: Thanks for your question. This is a two-year rate according to Au Yeung et al. who reported that the two-year event-free survival rate was 100% (Reference 2).

Reviewer #4:

Comment: Methods. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail but it don't precised the material used and by what firm it have been produced.

Response: We have added the material used and company information in Table S2.

Comment: Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a

clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently?

Response: Thank you for your comments. We have added the related points in DISCUSSION.

Comments: The figures are in high quality and are well illustrated despite the histological plates which do not show by arrows the places of phagocytosis with arrows which is very important for the confirmation of the Burkitt lymphoma.

Response: An arrow has been added to indicate the places of phagocytosis.

Comments: Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript is well organized in a logical approach.

Response: Thank you for your encouraging comments.

Comments: Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report.

Response: Yes, we have prepared our manuscript according to the CARE Checklist – 2016, and stated this in the text.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript under consideration is well within the scope of the journal. The manuscript describes a rare case of BLL with 11 q aberration and has adequately discussed the case along with the relevant literature. The manuscript requires minor improvement in the English language grammatical correction. The authors are requested to modify the manuscript

as per the peer reviewer's comments

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Response: Thank you for your comments. Proofreading and further polishing of the manuscript have been conducted by a professional English language editing company. An editorial certificate is attached.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research

results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response: Thanks for your suggestions. The original figures have been provided and revised as required in the form of PowerPoint slides. These figures are all original and labelled by de Novo. We have added a new reference and related findings in the DISCUSSION (Reference 17).