

Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/apm-24-53>

Reviewer A

This was a very interesting case report to read, thank you. The article requires language editing to help shorten long sentences for ease of reading. I've made some suggestions in red ink.

Reply to comments

In accordance with the Reviewer's recommendations, we have revised our manuscripts.

We have corrected most of them as pointed out by the Reviewer, but kept the old article on physical symptoms for the following reasons:

Stroebe et al. stated that not many recent papers have been published on somatic symptoms.

We are keen to emphasize the importance of our paper because the association with somatic symptoms has been pointed out for a long time, but prior studies are old and very few recent ones have been published.

Reviewer B

My main concern with the study is that the "why" is not clear from the beginning. Only at the very end do you get some idea of why it is important to look at physical symptoms. This is not sufficient, it should be clear from the very beginning. Because of this, the Introduction requires major revision because the rationale is unclear. Accordingly, I find the Introduction under-referenced, with two specific references being very outdated.

Reply to comments

We thank the reviewer for these insightful comments. In accordance with the Reviewer's comment, we have revised our manuscripts, and clearly show the importance of looking at physical symptoms at the beginning of introduction (Page 2 Highlight box lines 43-46, Page 4 lines 83-90)

My second major concern is the use of "headaches" as an example - it is such a general symptom. While the authors comment on this at the very end as a limitation, it is not enough. I'm afraid many readers will see the example of "headaches" and immediately stop reading

further as it seems so insignificant. Consider adding more examples of symptoms, especially in the Introduction. Use examples of war veterans who feel like they also lost a leg, or who feel like they're being hit by shrapnel. Just something to give more strength to the argument.

Reply to comments

We thank the Reviewer for this insightful comment. In accordance with the Reviewer's comment, we have changed from "headache" to "severe headache reminiscent of a brain tumor". (page5, lines 106-107)

Third, the authors can elaborate a bit on the treatment they provided. Currently, the intervention appears superficial.

Reply to comments

We thank the Reviewer for this insightful comment. In accordance with the Reviewer's comments, we have added interventions in detail. (page 6, lines 141-143)

Fourth, Please elaborate more on the Discussion, if you add the headings "Limitations" and "Implications", it becomes evident that the Discussion is very limited.

Reply to comments

We thank the Reviewer for this insightful comment. In accordance with the Reviewer's comments, we have added headings "Limitations" and "Implications". We have deepened our description by citing the literature in our Discussion. (page 7, lines 166-173, 186-191, page 8 lines 204-207)

Lastly, please see the comment regarding the figure (I've attached a PDF file).

Reply to comments

We thank the Reviewer for this insightful comment. In accordance with the Reviewer's advice, we have divided Figure2 into two parts (Figure2A, 2B) to prevent confusion.