

Response to Reviewers

Thank you for your very careful review of our manuscript “**NO: 69693**”, and for the comments, corrections and suggestions that ensued. A minor revision of the paper has been carried out to take all of them into account. And in the process, we believe the paper has been significantly improved. We also have carefully responded to each of the reviewers’ comment in the text below, indicating where we have revised the manuscript.

Reviewer #1

Dear Reviewer

We deeply appreciate the time and effort you’ve spent on reviewing my manuscript. Your comments are really thoughtful and in-depth and we do honestly agree with them. We provide detailed responses to each comment below.

Reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

-> Thank you very much for this comment.

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. Please specify what kind of “antibiotics and antipyretics” administered before admission.

-> Thank you very much for this comment.

I have added detailed explanation to the CASE PRESENTAYION

2. Page 7 “immunoglobulin M (IgM) 13” is confusing

-> Thank you very much for this comment.

I have added detailed explanation to the CASE PRESENTATION and reference [10]

3. Page 8 “On hospital day (HD) 3, test results showed improvement, which were as follows: CRP level increased to 5.71 mg/dL and AST and ALT levels to 85 U/L and 198 U/L” sounds a little bit awkward.

-> Thank you very much for this comment.

I have made the appropriate changes

4. Why did you detect the level of BNP? Did the patient have new symptoms during the treatment?

-> Thank you very much for this comment.

I have added detailed explanation to the CASE PRESENTATION

5. The manuscript should be reviewed as there are multiple sentences in which the grammar/sentence structure is incorrect and this is confusing.

-> Our revised manuscript was performed language polishing that would ensure all grammatical, syntactical, formatting and other related errors be resolved.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Every thing is looking good. all the parameters mention here according to checklist and all are included nicely

-> Thank you very much for this comment.