

January 1, 2023

Re: Response to manuscript 81991

Dear Editor.

Thanks for providing us with this great opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript. We appreciate the detailed and constructive comments provided by the reviewers. We have carefully revised the manuscript by incorporating all the suggestions by the review panel.

We hope this revised manuscript has addressed your concerns, and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

The Authors

Encl. Responses to the comments from Reviewer 1 and 2.

Reply to reviewer #1:

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you very much for your time involved in reviewing the manuscript and your very encouraging comments on the merits.

Comments:The authors should avoid providing extensive summaries of the case report within the introduction session. The introduction should focussed on the disease background, burden, rationale for publication or study objectives. The case summary can be reflected in the abstract, Case report session, discussion or conclusion. Please provide a rationale in the introduction why the Two cases of prostate lymphoma is significant for publication. The authors mentioned (Both kidneys and ureters were dilated with fluid). Please consider terms like hydronephrosis or hydroureteronephrosis. Does this statement (the patient underwent prostate puncture and electrosurgery of the bladder mass for pathological biopsy) means transrectal core prostate biopsy and transurethral resection biopsy? Please revise the conclusion to avoid run-on sentences.

The rationale for publication of this article is to provide clinical experience with this rare disease. An introduction has been installed requesting why these two cases of prostate lymphoma

are of interest for publication. In addition has been changed from (both kidneys and ureters have fluid expansion) to ureteral hydronephrosis. Revised to read that the patient underwent transrectal prostate biopsy.

Response to Reviewer 2:

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you very much for your time involved in reviewing the manuscript and your very encouraging comments on the merits.

Comments: Very rare case reports regarding Primary prostate lymphoma. The purpose of writing the introduction is to explain why the author wants to report this case; is there anything unique or new about Primary prostate lymphoma? The author should not define the case in the introduction section. The author should be able to explain in more detail the patient's clinical symptoms, diagnostic procedures, and therapy performed on this patient. The second case was confusing for diagnosis, mainly because there was an enlarged lymph node in the pelvic area. In the discussion section, it is better to add a discussion regarding PPL's

specific treatment (chemotherapy and or radiotherapy) and prognosis survival rate. Authors should be able to consult with native speakers to improve English grammar. The author should explain the limitations of this case report.

Primary prostatic lymphoma is unique in that its initial diagnosis is similar to that of benign prostate disease, and it is often severe when symptoms appear. A detailed explanation of the clinical symptoms, diagnostic procedures and treatment of the patient has been included in the manuscript. The second case of lymph node swelling in the pelvic region caused by rapid metastasis of primary prostate lymphoma has been improved in the text. In the discussion section, a discussion on specific therapeutic chemotherapy and prognostic survival of PPL has been added. English grammar of the manuscript has been requested and improved through English proficiency awareness. A description of the limitations of this case report has been added after the discussion.

Sincerely,

The Authors

