

**Unexplained bleeding as a presentation of Munchausen syndrome: A case report.**

Rahman M et al. (maheensmc@gmail.com)

**Mechanical review**

Comments	Author's response
-	-

**Technical review**

Reviewer's information – A			
Date review assigned	29-Dec-23	Date review completed	08-Jan-24
Reviewer name	A	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	-	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	No
Reviewer's comments (29-Jan-2024) [Please select "Yes" or "No"]	Score [out of 10]	Author's response (01-Feb-2024) [Please write a response if score is less than 6. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]	
1. How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	6	-	
2. Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	6	-	
3. Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	6	-	
4. Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	8	-	
The article is brief but covered all aspect of clinical issues for a case report. Just few things need to be addressed –		Thank you for the comments and valuable feedback. The point-by-point responses to the reviewers' comments are given below.	
1. Why this case is reporting? Rationale of the case report writing. Authors should add these issues in introduction.		1. We have revised the Introduction section and the rationale of the case report writing is added to improve the depth of the manuscript (lines 50 – 57).	
2. After conclusion , recommendation should be added for the psychiatrists and specialists from other disciplines when the will manage a case of bleeding manifestations .		2. We have included a recommendation section to improve the depth of the manuscript (lines 118 - 124).	
Reviewer's Recommendation	Minor revision		

Reviewer's information – B			
Date review assigned	29-Dec-23	Date review completed	11-Jan-24
Reviewer name	Syed Emdadul Haque	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	0000-0002-9739-1225	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes
Reviewer's comments (29-Jan-2024) [Please select "Yes" or "No"]	Score [out of 10]	Author's response (01-Feb-2024) [Please write a response if score is less than 6. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]	
1. How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	2	Revised the Introduction and rationale to improve the depth of the manuscript.	
2. Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	3	Revised the writing.	
3. Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	2	Rewrite the rationale to make he manuscript a valuable one to the world of knowledge.	
4. Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	2	Ethical approval was not sought because this is a case report. However, consent was obtained from the patient to prepare this manuscript.	

<b>Reviewer's information – B</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is not suitable for the public as this does not carry good scientific merit.</li> <li>2. The structure is not good.</li> <li>3. No ethical approval.</li> <li>4. Lack of information on Introduction.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This case study provides compelling scientific data on Munchausen syndrome, catering to both physicians and anyone (people) seeking knowledge about this condition. People will be able to learn about the presentation of the patients of such patients and clinicians will be able to obtain a guideline for diagnosing and managing such patients from this case report. Publishing such reports will potentially aid in the formulation of protocols and guidelines for the management of factitious disorder cases.</li> <li>2. We have revised our manuscript and followed the case report presenting structure instructed by the author's guidelines of the BSMMU journal.</li> <li>3. It is a case report, and informed consent was taken from the patient and we have mentioned it in the manuscript.</li> <li>4. We have revised the Introduction section and necessary changes are made to improve the depth of the manuscript.</li> </ol>
<b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b>	Resubmit elsewhere

<b>Responsible Editor's comments (29-Jan-2024)</b>		<b>Author's response (01-Feb-2024)</b>
Name	M Mostafa Zaman	[Please write a response if score is less than 6. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
ORCID	0000-0002-1736-1342	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Follow the Journal's style for Author Contribution.</li> <li>2. Do not use et al for-listing authors. List all of them.</li> <li>3. Are the references 2 and 9 refer to the same document?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revised the author's contribution as per journal's instructions.</li> <li>2. Revised the references list and given name of all authors.</li> <li>3. Removed reference 2 and replaced by 9.</li> </ol>	
<b>Editor's Decision</b>	Major revision	

<b>Final decision of the Executive Editor (01-Feb-2024)</b>	<p>We decide to: <b>ACCEPT</b></p> <p>We shall edit the manuscript soon for your concurrence.</p>
---	---