

Revision Letter

Thank you for your careful review of our manuscript and for providing us with helpful suggestions.

Appropriate changes have been made in the manuscript. Please note that changes from the initial revision are highlighted in red, versus changes from this current revision are highlighted in green.

Additionally, please note that with regard to errors in the references, we have uploaded two separate pairs of manuscript files with slightly different reference styles (see comment #2 for additional details).

Each of the specific comments is repeated, and our response/revisions immediately follows:

New Comments

1. The abstract actually does not exist as there are only three sentences including 3 not spelled abbreviations. The Authors should use the allotted space and put as much information as possible as it increases the visibility of their work.

We had initially only uploaded the abstract in the “abstract” section of the website and not into the manuscript file itself. We have now placed it in both the manuscript and the abstract section of the website. Please note that the abstract was also significantly updated in the first revision per the originally suggested changes, and we’ve made a few minor interval updates.

2. Also, in the era of easily available software to list the cited references one would expect a flowless list of references. This is not the case here as seldom it can be seen in submitted manuscripts such as sloppy work, especially in such reports.

For instance, in randomly selected references below from their list, there are over 40 formatting errors! Is this a correct way to pay attention to details in scientific writing?

Our apologies for the continued errors. We had used Endnote’s Sage Vancouver style for the references but overlooked some of the formatting mistakes. In this revision, we have extensively looked through the references and cross-checked it with one of our experienced publishing editors. As a double check, we also cross-checked our references with those of previously published NRJ case reports. We did note that there was a slight difference in reference style between PDFs of NRJ case reports versus the NRJ online webpage publication. Specifically, the references listed on the website do not italicize journal names, and they include commas between the last name and first initials of authors. Therefore, we have uploaded a copy of the manuscript that follows the format of NRJ PDFs and a separate copy that follows the format of the NRJ website so that the preferred style can be used.

3. Avoid the word “case” as the patient is not a case, and if there is a reference to the manuscript it is enough to say the “report” instead of a “case report”.

We have removed all uses of the word “case” and replaced them “report” or other language as appropriate.

4. All abbreviations should be spelled out when first used. In the abstract, a phrase should be used over 3 times in order to replace it with an abbreviation, while in the body of the manuscript over 5 times.

All abbreviations are now spelled out initially and used over 5 times if abbreviated.

Prior comments

5. The abstract is poorly written. „We present a case...” - but the key symptoms and results of the presentation are missing. „We also compare our case to other similar instances...” So where are the results? Also, take into account that the patient is not a case. This is medical jargon.

We have rewritten the abstract to include the details of the patient’s presentation, symptoms, and clinical course.

6. No details of MRI and PET/CT examinations are provided.

We were not sure if the reviewer was asking for clinical details or details of the actual imaging examinations such as scan parameters. In this draft, we added a more detailed explanation of the clinical circumstances that led to the patient’s MRI and PET/CT. Additionally, we have added more details of our interpretation of both exams. However, if scan parameters are requested, we would be happy to add those in.

7. Based on the rare findings the patient can be identified, thus, the patient needs to provide consent to publish the results.

Consent has now been obtained from the patient to publish his case report as well as images from his MRI, PET/CT, and pathology slides.

8. The manuscript is dedicated to the NRJ readers, but the Authors did not review the papers published by the NRJ on the subject of stem cells. There are 197 records in the NRJ after searching the archives of the NRJ using the words “stem cells“. The Authors need to justify and discuss why the NRJ Readers need to read their manuscript compared to those already published.

Thank you for pointing this out. We have reviewed prior NRJ publications regarding the subject of stem cells. Many provide an excellent discussion of both beneficial uses and possible complications of stem cell administration. We have added a few references specifically from NRJ. We have also added more discussion on the unique features of this case and its clinical relevance.

9. All pathological findings seen on the images need to be labeled with arrows and appropriately described in the figure legends.

The figures have been updated to include arrows, all of which are now referred to in the figure legends.

10. There are numerous formatting errors in the reference list.

Thank you for noting this. We had originally used Endnote's Sage Vancouver style, but we've notice that it automatically adds the DOI numbers at the end of each reference, as well as some additional information that I see is not in other NRJ publications. We have manually removed these extraneous items. Please kindly let us know if additional formatting changes should be made; we'd be more than happy to do that.

All of the above revisions have been made in the manuscript as well.