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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

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?: Yes

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Authors submitted an interesting case report which shall be published. My only concern is with the extensivity of the neurological investigation, and especially with the proof of patient not being suffering from non-convulsive complex partial status epilepticus. It is necessary to specify in the paper what types of MRI (i.e. sequences - T2 included?) and EEG (nativ, sleep deprivation, prolonged EEG, supplemental recording electrodes - anterotemporal?) have been performed. I am wondering if patients underwent other investigations (e.g. FDG-PET, SPECT or CSF examination) which can help to exclude underlying epileptic or organic pathology within a mesiotemporal region. If results of these investigations are missing, this issue should be discussed more cautiously.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable