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Dear Editor,

thank you for your friendly electronic mail from November 17th 2011 and the favourable overall assessment of our manuscript made by the referee. We also appreciate his valuable suggestions for further improving the paper.

We have carefully considered all suggestions made by the reviewer and have revised the manuscript accordingly. All changes in the manuscript are highlighted with bold letters.

In the following, we will respond to the referee’s comments on an item-by-item basis.

Referee #1 (Salih Selek):

We thank the referee for his second assessment and the suggestions made for further improving the paper:

1. The referee suggested to modify the title of the case report. We changed the former title “Successful treatment of schizophrenia with melperone-augmented haloperidole in a patient with phenotypic evidence for CYP2D6 ultrarapid metabolizer status: a case report” to “Successful treatment of schizophrenia with melperone augmentation in a phenotypic CYP2D6 ultrarapid metabolizer status” accordingly.

2. We now included the German guideline (according to the society of Neurology, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy) that we used for our argumentation during the second review process (now: Reference number 5).
3. We defined “insufficient antipsychotic effect” regarding the reported treatment with amisulpride. Therefore, we added a new sentence in the case presentation section: “Since psychopathological findings did not change under treatment with amisulpride and still presented as on admission time the antipsychotic effect of amisulpride was evaluated to be insufficient according to the treatment guideline for schizophrenia of the German Association for Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Neuroscience (DGPPN) [5].”

4. We agree with the reviewer that several modifications of the antipsychotic treatment during a comparatively short period of time is problematic in general. We now provide a statement in the discussion section that states this circumstance: “Retrospectively, the repeated modifications of psychopharmacotherapy in this case during a comparatively short period of time are problematic and thus, e.g. continuation of amisulpride for a longer interval should have been attempted.”

5. The English idiom again has been corrected.

We again thank the referees for the helpful comments, hope that the changes now qualify the manuscript for publication in the Journal of Medical Case Reports, and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Maximilian Gahr, M.D.
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