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Reviewer's report:

The paper is substantially improved. In responding to the other reviewer, the authors have left out some important information. My comments are as follows.

- In the Abstract, the first sentence of Case Presentation is not a complete sentence (no verb and no object).
- “Routine laboratory studies were normal” is superior to “did not show any disturbances in her biochemistry.”
- “The QT interval was normal” is superior to “did not show prolongation of the QT interval.” It is generally better to describe what is present rather than what is absent.
- “Substantial” adds nothing to QT interval of 520 ms. Despite what the other reviewer said, the QTc interval (using Bazett’s formula) needs to be reported. At a heart rate of 60-80 bpm, Bazett is satisfactory.
- Drop “contrary to current belief” in the Conclusions of the Abstract. That is just trying to pick a fight.
- In Background, the authors may want to remind the reader that R-fluoxetine never reached the market because of possible QT interval prolongation. Also, in overdose, citalopram will increase the QT interval in humans just as normal doses increase the QT interval in beagle dogs.
- I am assuming some one in editorial office of BMC Emergency Medicine will clean up to sloppy syntax. (For example “Physical examination revealed a blood pressure of 137/70 mmHg and a regular pulse of 60 b.p.m.—examination of the heart, lungs and abdomen were all normal.” I will comment no further on the sloppy English.
- Include expected (“normal”) serum sertraline ranges along side measured levels.
- I still don’t think the EKGs add anything. If you have the space, publish them.
- I am not sure what constituted “strict guidance of her psychiatrist” means. Does that mean she never received more than a week’s supply and was seen weekly in perpetuity?
- I would still shorten the paper considerably. There remains too much redundancy and irrelevant material.