Response to reviewers and science editor

To reviewer #1:

An interesting case.

------Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript and comment.

To reviewer #2:

This is an interesting case report of lymphoma of maxillary sinus with multiple metastasis including uncommon cutaneous areas. The following point is suggested for further consideration. 1. Please discuss the possibility for T cell origin as well as for the sinus/nasal origin. 2. Immunohistochemical staining of T cell marker would need also be used for confirmative diagnosis.

------Immunohistochemical staining of T cell marker; CD3, CD7, and CD45RO were negative, therefore we excluded the possibility for T cell origin as well as for the sinus/nasal origin. We added these sentences to the section of "Further diagnostic work-up".

To reviewer #3:

It would be more reasonable if there were genetic test results.

------Unfortunately, genetic test was not performed. We added the sentence to the section of "Further diagnostic work-up".

To reviewer #4:

This article on a pretty uncommon / rare case of a primary paranasal lymphoma. Authors have made good efforts to refer appropriate literature to write this manuscript. I than them for brining this to the attention. However, there are many grammatical errors with repetition. Although as per the report, it was a primary lymphoma in the nasal sinus, authors should consider discussing post splenectomy secondary malignancies (note this patient had prior splenectomy), where a patient can develop NHL, myelodysplasia etc. Author should look at histology of the removed spleen and add a comment as well.

------We asked native speakers again, who are in English proofreading company to correct grammatical errors.

In addition, as you mentioned, it was a primary lymphoma in the nasal sinus and this patient had prior splenectomy, therefore we should have considered post splenectomy secondary malignancies. On the other hand, we could not get information of histology

about the removed spleen. We inserted the matter into limitation section and added reference (number 40).

To Science editor:

The authors did not provide original pictures. 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.

------ We provided the original figure documents. In addition, we found a duplication of reference number 12 and 15, therefore we deleted and align the reference numbers. We are very sorry about that.

To 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.

------Thank you very much for comment. We revised our manuscript and submitted again.