

RESPONSE to REVIEWERS

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 12791

We thank the reviewers for their comments, and address their remarks and critics below:

Reviewer 1:

This is an interesting review. The authors reviewed pathogenesis, clinical features, laboratory findings and treatment options of two Voltage gated calcium channel (VGCC) antibodies-related diseases (Lambert–Eaton myasthenic syndrome (LEMS) and paraneoplastic cerebellar degeneration). However, this manuscript is poorly written, and there are several major issues that need attention.

1. In this review, the author just listed the data that has been reported, lacking analysis and critical discussion. The review must be a concise in depth review of the topic and the review must be focused.

In this revision we tried to improve our manuscript both in language and critical content. We focused on the pathogenic and clinical aspects and abbreviated the manuscript.

2. In the “Lambert–Eaton myasthenic syndrome” section, most of the presented data is handbook knowledge-the authors do not provide anything new or innovative to the literature.

Disorders related to VGCC antibody are very rare and not published extensively. We added our unpublished clinical experience, for instance by drawing attention to:

- Concomitant autoimmune diseases as myasthenia gravis and vitiligo in NT-LEMS patients (5th page, 7th paragraph) .

-Rare LEMS case in a child in the absence of a neoplasm (3rd page, 7th paragraph).

3. The “Cerebellar degeneration associated with voltage gated calcium channel antibody” section is also not well-written. No subsections are provided. The association between voltage gated calcium channel antibody and cerebellar degeneration is not sufficiently explained.

We revised and divided the “Cerebellar degeneration associated with voltage gated calcium channel antibody” section. However in the literature, the association between VGCC and cerebellar degeneration is still unclear. A few data obtained from postmortem studies was given on page 7, paragraph 3.

4. The authors should check the entire manuscript for linguistic errors.

We thank the reviewer for this criticism. We made the necessary corrections.

Reviewer 2:

An interesting and very well written review article for a highly specialized topic in Neurology. No further comments or suggestions.

We would like to thank to the reviewer for this kind evaluation.