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### PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compulsory REVISION comments</th>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                              | Since there are two cell lines (mosaicism), according to the human cytogenetic nomenclature the karyotype formula appearing in the title must be checked. Figure 1 is not necessary; the way a ring chromosome is produced is pretty elementary. In table 1 it appears that this patient did not have microcephaly, then head circumference should had been measured, and it should be less than the 3rd centile compared to appropriate, age matched, normal standards; but neither head circumference measurement was described in the case presentation, nor the centile of weight and height. It was written: “The G band technique (400 bands) was applied to analyze cells from the patient and their relatives”, what relatives are they talking about? In figure 3 it appears “G-banded karyotype of the patient”. The patient had a mosaicism, what about the dicentric ring chromosome 13. Both of them must appear. | - The title has been changed  
- The figure 1 has been removed.  
- The patient was diagnosed by a medical geneticist and her form has been described as not having microcephaly. So we describe the table according to the form.  
- We meant the parents when said the word relatives. So it was sound confused. We have just change this part |
| Minor REVISION comments       | It appears “written informed consent was obtained from the patient”. The patient is a mental retarded girl; she could not sing any informed consent. It is supposed that it was signed by her parents or tutors. | - The informed consent was revised as suggested. |
| Optional/General comments | Check the use of English language | -  We’ve just revised the English language according suggested.  
- The initial of the patient have been removed. |

No element that allow patient identification is convenient, even her initials.