

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear Authors; The manuscript is well written. The the abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The subject is interesting. But similarity rate is 65%. It should less than 20%. It should be rephrased. If manuscript edit There are some grammatical mistakes in the manuscript. You should check spelling rules.

Dear reviewer, thank you very much for your questions. I have rephrased the manuscript and reduced the similarity rate to less than 20% and the manuscript have been re-edited by AJE company.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The article is well written with an informative Introduction and then a nice case presentation follows, discussing clinical picture and the neurological status, flowing by the diagnostics and treatment. Overall, the paper is well written, suitable for publication and adds new knowledge to his area. Was the patent discharged with antiepileptic therapy, beside a corticosteroid? How frequent is the follow up? Any anticipations for the future? Overall, I recommend the article for publication in its present form.

Dear reviewer, thank you very much for your questions. The patent was discharged with antiepileptic therapy and corticosteroid. He is followed up every two months. At present, the patient has been followed for more than one year, symptoms have not recurred. Both routine blood examinations and clinical biochemistry were performed every two months and showed no abnormalities.