

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade A (Excellent)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Dear author, Thank you for a nice work done on the ovarian teratoma related anti-NMDAR encephalitis. The method and the results described are relevant and needed for a detailed review of the issue. My concerns are that article is little lengthy and can be shorted. Typically the introduction should be limited to 300-350 words describing the main problem and the hypothesis or main area of review to be done. The discussion is also a bit lengthy and can be shortened. A consort flow diagram of search strategies, article searched, excluded and reason of exclusion should be mentioned. Please mention the full form of all abbreviation in the main manuscript when they appear first.

**Authors response to Reviewer 1's feedback:** First and foremost, the authors would like to thank the reviewer for his/her time and constructive feedback which has definitely helped improve the manuscript. The authors thank the reviewer for his/her encouraging and kind words.

The reviewer has expressed concerns about the length of Introduction and Discussion. We have edited both of these sections to cut them short but we would also like to point out that we wish to present readers with adequate background and discussion and, therefore, we would request this reviewer to kindly allow us to keep 441 words in Introduction (down from 562 in the original submission) and 1217 words in Discussion (down from 1347 in the original submission). Moreover, the total words in the article now are 2824 (from start of Introduction to end of Conclusion) which is itself reasonable low word count for a detailed manuscript. We sincerely hope that this length will be acceptable to the reviewer.

As suggested by the reviewer, a consort flow diagram has been added to revised manuscript as new Figure 1

Also, as suggested by this reviewer, we have mentioned full forms of abbreviations at first mention. Additionally, we have provided a list of abbreviations before Introduction.

## EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

### *(1) Science editor:*

1-Scientific quality: The manuscript is a case report describes diagnosis and treatment of 6 ovarian teratoma cases associated with Anti-NMDAR(N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor)

encephalitis, in addition to a literature review. (1) Classification: Grade D (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Strengths: The work submitted by the authors is relevant and topic of interest of the readers. The method and the results described are relevant and needed for a detailed review of the issue. Weakness: The article is little lengthy and can be shorted Suggested changes: Typically the introduction should be limited to 300-350 words describing the main problem and the hypothesis or main area of review to be done. The discussion is also a bit lengthy and can be shortened. A consort flow diagram of search strategies, article searched, excluded and reason of exclusion should be mentioned. Please mention the full form of all abbreviation in the main manuscript when they appear first. (3) Format: Figures of sufficient quantity but the quality is not the best. (4) References: The citation of references is sufficient and reasonable. The number of references cited (42) and the number of references published in last 3 years (3). (5) Self-cited references: 0. (6) References recommendations: No suggested references by the reviewer. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. A language editing certificate was not provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found by the Google/Bing search for this case. Ethical committee approval is not provided (not always required for a case report). Informed consent was provided. 4 Supplementary comments: The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. 5 Issues raised: (1) Introduction is too long, redundancy should be avoided. (2) No histopathology pictures provided. (3) In figures' legends, type of charts are not provided. (4) Table 1 should be rearranged, no need for the section of (Journal name) (5) Table3 may be replaced by a chart. (6) References' should adhere to the journal rules. (7) Language editing by experts is essential for this manuscript. 6 Re-Review: Required by review1. 7 Recommendation: Conditional Accept. (Also I recommend additional reviewer)

**Authors response to Science Editor's feedback:** The authors would like to thank the science editor for his/her detailed comments and feedback. Because of all the suggestions, the article has substantially improved.

The concern about length has been addressed in our response to Reviewer 1 above. In summary, our article now only has 2824 words (excluding references) and we hope this length is acceptable.

We have now provided consort flow diagram, as requested.

Abbreviations has been provided before the main text and at the first mention.

Figure quality has been improved and we can provided even higher resolution figures, if needed.

Histopathology figure has been provided (please see new Figure 2).

We have now indicated type of charts (pie chart, bar diagram, scatter plot and bar diagram and van diagram, as appropriate) in the figure legends.

Table 1 has been edited, as suggested, to exclude journal name.

Table 3 provides many different pieces of information and we believe it is best represented as Table 3 and changing it to Figure might be confusing to readers.

References have been edited as per journal style. Please let us know if this is not the case and we will gladly re-edit them.

Language has been edited by native English speakers as part of our University's language editing team.

## *(2) Company editor-in-chief:*

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the 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. **Before its final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the Signed Informed Consent Form(s) or Document(s) of treatment. For example, authors from China should upload the Chinese version of the document, authors from Italy should upload the Italian version of the document, authors from Germany should upload the Deutsch version of the document, and authors from the United States and the United Kingdom should upload the English version of the document, etc. The author(s) must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company.** Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>.

**Authors response to Company Editor-in-chief's feedback:** The feedback from editor-in-chief that our work met the basic publishing requirements is encouraging.

As requested, we now provide Signed Informed consent forms in Chinese language.

As for the language editing, our University has an office to help authors with English editing. Native English speakers are employed by this office to assist us and we have got our manuscript edited by them.