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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Thank you for your letter and for the constructive comments. Your valuable comments have helped us revise and improve our manuscript, in addition to being an important guidance to our researches. We have studied the comments carefully and have made corrections in the manuscript accordingly. The revised portions have been marked in red. We hope that the corrections in our revised manuscript will be met with approval. The main corrections made in the manuscript and the responses to the reviewer’s comments are detailed below.

Editor Comments: The quality of the English does not meet requirements.

Response: Thank you for pointing out the problem about the quality of the English. We have asked for the professional help to revise the manuscript according to your suggestion, and the manuscript has been reviewed by native English speakers.

Reviewer #1

Dear Prof. Nur Arslan,

We sincerely appreciate your constructive suggestions, which have helped us improve the quality of the work.

Comment 1: An introduction (or background) section can be added to paper instead of case summary section.
Response: Thank you for pointing this out. We are very sorry for our negligence of this. The Introduction and Background Sections have been added, and the Case Summary Section has been deleted.

Comment 2: Figures were uploaded twice.

Response: Thank you very much for your detailed suggestions. Duplicate uploads have been deleted.

Reviewer #2

Dear Prof. Biswaroop Chakrabarty,

Thank you for giving your valuable suggestions. We have made corresponding corrections in the revised manuscript.

Comment 1: The language needs significant editing

Response: Thank you for pointing out this problem. We have corrected the language errors with the professional help and the native English speakers.

Comment 2: The quality of EEG images is poor

Response: Thank you very much for your detailed suggestions. It is really true as you suggested. Unfortunately, the original computer data was lost. We tried our best to recover it, but failed. Therefore, the EEG images are from the paper reports. The hospital where I work forbids technical manipulations on medical images. We have added a clearer picture of the original in the supplementary material.