The authors would like to thank all reviewers for their kind contribution and the valuable suggestions provided to improve our project. The following table includes a point-by-point response to each of the issues.

Reviewers' comments and authors' response	Where can the changes be found	
	Page	Line
1/2 Reviewer #1: The discussion should be improved. **Author response: The discussion section included a comprehensive dialogue on the drug class and mechanism of action, indications, safety, adverse effects, and drug debate. Then, the discussion included a section about dermatomyositis followed by a discussion of the presented case in our study as well as our suggestions and the take-home message. We have tried to conduct a literature review of the cases presented with similar issue of our patient; hence, no previous studies were found.	Page 8-9	
2/2 Reviewer #1: diagnosis of this disease by sampling, I wish sampling could be possible. it is OK. **Author response: Diagnosis by sampling was one of our priorities, however, the patient was booked for it, but unfortunately, she refused. We have included this fact within the revised manuscript.	Page 7	Last line in "final diagnosis" section
1/7- Reviewer #2: It is better not to use brand name of drugs. **Author response: We agree with the reviewer's comment, However, the cited articles in the discussion most of them mention the drug brand. Though we are obligated to do so.	-	-
2/7- Reviewer #2: It is good to mention acronyms in upper case (Eg.: OD instead of od) **Author response: We have edited the following (od → OD).	Page 7	Outcome and follow- up section
3/7- Reviewer #2: Please mention the dose of prednisolone used along with duration during tapering phase and as patient has not completed the course of steroid, please mention the treatment plan for steroid. **Author response: We have mentioned the dose and the duration under the Treatment section "patient was administered 60 mg of prednisolone for 45 days". Moreover, we mentioned the tapering plan under the Outcome and Follow-up.	Page 7	Treatment section
4/7- Reviewer #2: After how many days of treatment did the patient showed clinical improvement? **Author response: She showed clinical improvement 2 weeks after receiving the treatment. We have mentioned that under OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP SECTION.	Page 7	Outcome and follow- up section

5/7- Reviewer #2: How frequently patient was followed up and what are the workup and signs that were evaluated during the follow up?	Page 7	Outcome and follow- up section
** Author response: Clinical evaluation and CK level were used to assess the patient's improvement. We mentioned that under the OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP SECTION.		
6/7- Reviewer #2: Please try to make a concise conclusion. **Author response: The conclusion was edited based on the suggestion.	Page 10	-
7/7- Reviewer #2: Reference 2: please check spelling of elderly. Reference 12, 13: please follow the journal/ standard guideline to cite. **Author response: the title of reference 2 included "eldly" instead of "elderly". So, the name was kept according to their report. All other references were edited according to the reviewer's request.	Page	-