

### **Response to Reviewer #1**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Hello Thank you for this interesting and actual manuscript I have one comment: Please include in part OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP information about changing of laboratory testing in dynamic after treatment (CRP, Leucocytes, etc.)

**Response:**

We thank the reviewer for this excellent suggestion. And we have added more information in the OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP section in Page 6. Revised portions were highlighted in the version of our revised manuscript with blue color.

“Laboratory tests returned to normal: white blood cells (WBC)  $9.1 \times 10^9/L$ , neutrophils (N) 40.1%, lymphocytes (L) 52.6%, C-reactive protein (CRP) 4.0 mg/L. No abnormalities on fecal examination and urine analysis.”

### **Response to Reviewer #1**

**Reviewer #2:**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

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

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** it is well written case report although it is not uncommon yet the importance of this presentation to be considered in deferential diagnosis abstract is long to some extent case report is accepted discussion and conclusion are well written and clear references are adequate

**Response:**

Thank you very much for your kind and prompt comments based on our manuscript.