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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is an interesting case of a rare phenomenon of olivary hypertrophy post disruption of inhibitory fibers, which in this case was due to a pontine bleed. I have the following comments: 1. Please report more information in the abstract. Use the guide here: https://www.acponline.org/membership/residents/competitions-awards/acp-national-abstract-competitions/guide-to-preparing-for-the-abstract-competition/writing-a-clinical-vignette-case-report-abstract 2. The authors also need to upload better labelled figures. Very thick black arrows have been used in the image. Thin color arrows provide for better visuals. 3. Please add more references and add more discussion of relevant neuroanatomy. 4. Authors need to discuss more about the previous cases. They should compare and contrast this case. 5. Conclusion is poorly phrased. Please rewrite: "It is critical to avoid misdiagnosis and overmuch intervention by clinical manifestations and the MRI results. However, the treatment effect is not satisfactory." 6. Please upload CARE checklist with page numbers. You have uploaded one with just checkmarks.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Although this study report a rare case, but in practice, it can be encountered. Developing experience is crucial to improve the readiness. I would like the authors to specifically answer the following points: 1- laboratory examinations were in normal range, but they are not specified, it will be a good idea if the authors add a table to let us know these examinations and if there are specific examinations. 2- The authors did not mention about depression status that may encounter the clinical status, and this may affect the therapeutic response. please let us know about depression status in this case. 3- Regarding therapeutic options, there are other therapeutic options that may help including vitamin D, magnesium, please let us know if such options were taken into consideration.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I had provided several comments, only some of which seem to have been responded appropriately to. The rest, it is evident, authors have typed up a response just to satisfy the editorial office. The reviewer is not some person to whom the authors can provide any measure of response and simply get away with, without taking action. Reviewer is attempting to constructively engage with the paper. The paper has some major shortcoming which the reviewer tried to address that the authors do not recognize. 1. In this revision also, authors only write "Laboratory examinations: Blood test, biochemical test, urine test, stool test and myocardial enzyme spectrum test were conducted, and the test results were all in the normal range." This is considered insufficient. This is a scientific forum, not a presentation by a medical student that authors can get away by saying anything. I pointed this out prior and authors conveniently skipped over this. Kindly provide laboratory values of ALL ROUTINE INVESTIGATIONS at the time of admission, even if they are normal. Make a table.

2. Physical examination has been poorly described. All subsystems in neurological and neuromuscular examination MUST be commented upon. All systems should be commented upon. 3. Treatment has been described very poorly. Is this a treatment you give to people with motor deficits? Do the authors not give them multidisciplinary care? Do the authors not give them appropriate physical therapy and consultation with physiatrist? Then why do they not write this. I specifically gave the link to American College of Physicians (ACP) Guide to Writing a Case Vignette only because authors had written some of the sections poorly, yet authors made little change in this domain in this revised submission.