

Dear Editor,

Thank you for arranging a timely review for our manuscript. We have carefully evaluated the reviewers' critical comments and thoughtful suggestions, responded to these suggestions point-by-point, and revised the manuscript accordingly. With regard to the reviewers' comments and suggestions, we wish to reply as follows:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Reviewer's observations, comments and suggestions

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript?

ANSWER: Yes

[Response: Thanks.](#)

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? ANSWER: Yes.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? ANSWER: Yes.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? ANSWER: Yes.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? ANSWER: Does not apply.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? ANSWER: Does not apply.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? ANSWER: This report is a case of a recently identified mutated locus and suggests that late behavioral neurodevelopment may also be a clinical manifestation of the disease.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically?

ANSWER: Yes.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? ANSWER: Yes.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? ANSWER: Yes.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? ANSWER: Tables: the authors present a table, which they must present separately from the body of the manuscript and I suggest improving its appearance so that it is more understandable. Figure 1, I suggest the authors present each section of the figure larger so that it is better appreciated. In addition, they must be presented separately from the body of the manuscript.

[Response: Thanks for your advice. We have separated the Table and Figure from the body of the manuscript as you suggested.](#)

Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?

ANSWER: Authors should consider adding a figure footer to the figure with any explanatory annotations that enhance its interpretation.

[Response: Corresponding figure caption of Figure 1 has been added, please review again, thanks.](#)

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?

ANSWER: Does not apply.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units?

ANSWER: On page 4 of the manuscript in the presentation section, it is necessary for the authors to improve the writing of: T36.4 °C, R32 times / min, HR112 times / min, Wt9kg (P50-75), height75cm (P75), head circumference43m (P25-50),..... since several are not universal abbreviations. Likewise, its meaning is not clarified in several acronyms, such as: G3P3, EBV-DNA, DST, ACMG, _

[Response: Thanks for your comments. We have clarified these abbreviations in the manuscript, please review again.](#)

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? ANSWER:

Yes.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references?

ANSWER: No

[Response: Thanks.](#)

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? ANSWER: In the Discussion section, the authors must correct the embedding of the number of references, the most appropriate being in the corresponding paragraph at the end of this. For instance: Page 8: The first international case [4] of an NTCP-deficient child was reported in 2015 by Dutch authors with a mutation at c.755G > A (p. Arg252His). In a literature report [7], children with c.800C>T (p.Ser267Phe) pure mutation were between 25% and 75% of the same age group in terms of height and weight, 61% had jaundice (yellowing of eyes or skin), 23.1% had hepatomegaly, and proceeded with histopathological features including hepatocyte destruction, periportal inflammation, and fibrosis, resembling mild chronic viral hepatitis. Also in this same section, when referring to a reference by the name of its author or authors, the appropriate wording is to note only the first surname of the author and if there are several authors note only the first surname of the first author, followed by: et al and the reference number. On the other hand, on page 8 of the manuscript, in the Discussion section, the following paragraph should be improved since it is repetitive to write with authors and then part of the content of the references and re-register the references: "In the literature reports by Liu, R [6], Li, H [11], QIU JW [14] and VAN HERPE [15] regarding c.800C > T (p.Ser267Phe) [6], C . 595A > C (p.Ser199Arg) [11], c.263T > C (p.Ile88Thr) [14] and c.615 618del (p. Ser206Profs* 12) [15] loci mutation cases found patients with dyslipidemia and sex hormone disorders, and NTCP

deficient individuals were more prone to vitamin D deficiency, sex hormone and dyslipidemia.”

[Response: We have modified our reference format as you suggested, thank you.](#)

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? ANSWER: Yes.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?

ANSWER: Does not apply.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

Manuscript Peer-Review Specific Comments To Authors:* Please make your specific comments/suggestions to authors based on the above-listed criteria

checklist for new manuscript peer-review and the below-listed criteria for comments on writing.

The criteria for writing comments include the following three features: First, what are the original findings of this manuscript? ANSWER: This clinical case of a recently identified mutated locus suggests that delayed behavioral neurodevelopment may also be a clinical manifestation of the disease.

What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? ANSWER: Does not apply.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? ANSWER: Does not apply.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through experiments in this study? ANSWER: Does not apply.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

Second, what are the quality and importance of this manuscript? ANSWER: In general terms, the quality of the manuscript is good based on the category of the type of manuscript, case report

What are the new findings of this study? ANSWER: The high possibility that this genetic abnormality is the cause of behavioral neurodevelopmental delay in these cases.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the new concepts that this study proposes? ANSWER: None.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the new methods that this study proposed? ANSWER: None.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided?

ANSWER: Yes.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the unique insights that this study presented? ANSWER: This clinical case of a recently identified mutated locus suggests that delayed behavioral neurodevelopment may also be a clinical manifestation of the disease.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? ANSWER: None.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

Third, what are the limitations of the study and its findings? ANSWER: Be a report of a clinical case.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript?

ANSWER: Due to the infrequency of this genetic anomaly, the only alternative to reach valid conclusions in the future is to carry out a global registry and under a protocol of studies and uniform treatment.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? ANSWER: To clarify the entire spectrum of the clinical picture and the appropriate treatment of these patients to improve their prognosis, perhaps genetic engineering is the only alternative.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next?

ANSWER: To clarify the entire spectrum of the clinical picture and the appropriate treatment of these Patients.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice?

ANSWER: Increase interest in genetic engineering treatment.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript properly. The abstract summarizes well the work. The manuscript adequately describes the background and the manuscript describe methods. The discussion highlights the key points concisely, clearly and logically and the findings described can help doctor to identify these clinical findings. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important, and authoritative references and the author does not self-cite reference. The manuscript is concisely and coherently organized. As a new described mutation, it is important to report it in order to improve the knowledge about its presentation, symptoms and course.

[Response: Thanks.](#)

6 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 Please make clear what the sentence in the manuscript "in Table 1, renal function 3, cardiac enzymes 6, ion 7, anemia 4, lipids 5 were not significantly abnormal" means

Response: Sorry for making the confusion. The number indicated the items in each laboratory test, and the results were all normal. Thus, we rectified our description as "No abnormal laboratory results of renal function, cardiac enzymes, serum ion, anemia and blood lipids were found; immunoglobulin and complement assay were not abnormal" in the manuscript, please review again.

2 The patient presented with elevated directed bilirubin levels, this manuscript contained no information to exclude the obstructed lesions?

Response: Thanks very much for your comment. After a careful check, we found the data of directed and indirect bilirubin levels were written on the wrong sides, the data of directed bilirubin should belong to indirect bilirubin. Sorry for making this mistake, we have rectified this issue in the manuscript and table, please review again, thanks.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

(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. 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. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

[Response: We have uploaded the forms in the submitting system as you suggested.](#)