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Reviewer's report:

The authors present an interesting, well-written case of a MELAS Syndrome in a 63 year old patient. In my opinion, it is not commonly known that the initial manifestation can occur in an older age. Even if this is not the first case report to show this, I believe it is quite instructive, especially through the imaging figures. I have some suggestions to improve the manuscript (unfortunately there are no page numbers on my pdf):

Case presentation:

- …showed "epileptic activity". Specify if interictal changes or signs of seizure and which.
- I didn't find the lactate levels in the serum and the pH. Could you mention these

Discussion:

- Include the publication of Fang GL, Clin Interv Aging for patients over 60 years. They also present a case of a 63y old patient with MELAS
- I would change the statement on PRES: "diffusion is typically not restricted unless the course of disease is complicated by ischemic stroke". I have seen patients with cortical diffusion restriction in PRES myself. In a publication (The imaging spectrum of posterior reversible encephalopathy syndrome: A pictorial review. Brady E, Parikh NS, Navi BB, Gupta A, Schweitzer AD.) the frequency of diffusion restriction is stated as 11-26%.
- Following the last point I would modify the discussion explaining that the main imaging difference between MELAS and PRES seems to be the location, while clinical information will help to distinguish them when MELAS occurs in the occipital lobe
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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