

Answering reviewers

Reviewer #1: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript. I would like to commend on a job well-done by the authors. There is merit in the manuscript, being a novel mutation and I suggest the authors to make few minor revisions as mentioned below

- 1 Title Please change the title to- A novel compound heterozygous GPR56 gene mutation in a twin with lissencephaly- Case report with review of literature
- 2 Abstract The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript.
- Use full-forms like 5-months old, 1 day for timeline
- 3 Key words The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript
- 4 Introduction The authors have adequately described the introduction, including the aim of the paper and the importance of their case.
- 5 Case presentation. I would like the authors to give a bit more detail on the history of presenting illness like was the seizures progressive, how many episodes did the patient experience, how long did each episode last, any associated symptoms, aggravating or relieving factors, or any triggers etc. All other parts of the case report are adequately presented.
- 6 Literature review. The authors have made a good effort in compiling all reported cases of GPR56 mutations and have adequately summarized it in table 1.
- 7 Discussion. The discussion is concise and to the point. All key points are highlighted clearly and in a logical manner. The paper will be great addition to existing literature.
- 8 Illustrations and tables. The figures and tables are adequate, good quality and appropriately illustrates the contents of the article.
- 9 Biostatistics. Not Applicable
- 10 Units. Not Applicable
- 11 References. The manuscript has cited 22 references, and all are important and appropriate to the current article. There are no self-cited, omitted, incorrectly cited and/or over-cited references.
- 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript is well-organized and presented in a concise manner. It requires very minor language polishing for grammar and sentence organization before accepting for publication.
- 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors have prepared their manuscript according as per the

CARE Checklist for case reports [The authors have read the CARE Checklist (2016), and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the CARE Checklist (2016)]. 14 Ethics statements. Authors have submitted the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee (This study was approved by the ethics committee of Children's Hospital of Nanjing Medical University).

Response: Thank you for reviewing this manuscript. The title have been corrected, and we have added some relevant content in the history of presenting illness section.