

Response to reviewers and science editor

Thank you very much for your useful comments. We revised our manuscript based on your comment. Please see the revised manuscript to consider for the acceptance.

Reviewer #1:

Comments: 1. "19-year-old patient" was repeated at multiple places.--> Removed parts that were considered unnecessary repetitions. 2. Some sentences need refinements such as dry skin instead of dry epidermis. --> I have rewritten it to make it easier to understand. 3. Her limbs were weak due to disturbance of consciousness, but muscle tonus was normal, with no stiffness. This sentence needs restructuring. Proper CNS examination findings should be written.--> I have rewritten it to make it easier to understand. 4. In the treatment part, only treatment should be presented instead of giving general statements.-->Only treatment is described briefly, and assessment is described in the Discussion section. 5. Outcome - the patient was able to discontinue her vasopressors on the second hospital day. Did the patient discontinue her medication by herself? Repeat BP values should be given.--> Corrected the wording of the sentence and also mentioned specific blood pressure.

----- We corrected all these points. Thank you very much.

To reviewer #2:

Thank you for your positive comments. No corrections have been made.

To science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

----- Thank you very much. We revised the manuscript all.