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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Other

If other, please specify:
A new treatment method.

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

The paper is improved in general. However, there are some issues to be revised:
1. Explain your revision one by one, point by point. Although the made revisions are bold in the paper, it is difficult to follow which revision was made for which suggestion. Please identify specifically what you have done (removed/added, changed etc.) rather than stating general expressions such as "The core message of our report was limited"
2. "via/by" against "...the causation of..." is more suitable.

3. One week of quetiapine use and then taper it off due its "missing antipsychotic effect" is serious weakness in your case. If you think that one week is enough for the beginning of the antipsychotic effect and cessation of the drug you should cite a guideline.

4. (point 11) Again you should cite a guideline if you think 3 weeks is enough for deciding unresponsiveness.

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published