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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,
Thank you for your mail and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Sodium valproate induced acute pancreatitis in a bipolar disorder patient: a case report” (manuscript number: PHAT-D-18-00290R2). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our case. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are again marked red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewers’ comments are as followed:

Response to the reviewer’s comments:
Jiraganya Bhongsatiern, PhD (Reviewer 1):
First the study drug in our manuscript have been consistently referred to sodium valproate (Background, line 40, line 46, line 48, page 5) (Case presentation, line 10, page 18, page 6) (Case presentation, line 10, page 7) (Discussion and Conclusion, line 31, page 7) (Discussion and Conclusion, line 9-10, line 13, line 17-18, line 32, line 34, line 37, line 42, line 53, page 8). Second, the normal range for urine amylase has been added as suggested (Case presentation, line 41, page 6). Last but not least, the grammars and spelling in the manuscript have been checked again before the submission (Discussion and Conclusion, line 35, page 7). We apologize for our inappropriate writing, and have made correction according to the reviewer’s comments by using reputable English language editing service.

Georgios D. Kotzalidis (Reviewer 2):
First, we sincerely apologize for our imperfections in this report. According to your valuable suggestions, our manuscript has now been edited by a professional language editing service in order to render its reading more fluent. Some part of the abstract have been rewritten again to make it more concise (Abstract Background, line 35, page 4) (Abstract Case presentation, line 42, line 46, line 53, page 4). We greatly appreciate both your help and that of the referees.
concerning improvement to this paper. We hope that the revised manuscript is now suitable for publication.

Janet Mifsud de Gray, Phd (Reviewer 3):
We appreciate the positive feedback from the reviewer. Thank you so much.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in it. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes but marked in red in revised paper. We appreciate for Editors and Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for the comments and suggestions.