

Response to review

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This systematic review with meta-analyses evaluates effects of CBT on health outcomes in people with coronary heart disease. The manuscript is well organized and presented. The style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate and all analyses and features of checklists were addressed and taken into account. The background of this manuscript is well written, the discussion interprets the findings and key points appropriately. CBT was found to be effective in a large number of outcome studies not limited to mental illness but also for some psychiatric disorders, including depression, and in the treatment of non-psychiatric disorders such as chronic pain conditions. The effects of CBT in other diseases, for example its effects on insomnia or chronic fatigue should perhaps additionally be mentioned. All figures and tables are accurately presented and of good quality. Minor concern: Some spelling errors: Randomised or randomize? The spelling should be carried out in a unified manner throughout the manuscript. In Fig. 1 „insufficient datas“ (instead of „data“)

Author's response:

Thanks sincerely for your advice.

The “Submitted revision with changes” has been uploaded as the “Supplementary Material”.

- (1) The effects of CBT in other diseases, including hypertension, diabetes, chronic pain, and cancer, have been added to the paper.

See changes on page 18, line 480.

- (2) The “randomized” has been used in the paper.

- (3) Jing Sun and Nicholas Buys have edited the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general

readability. Corresponding modifications have been made in the manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Li et al. reported a systematic review and meta-analysis for the clinical effectiveness of cognitive-behavioral therapy in patients who had coronary heart disease. The study is well summarized and interesting, except for lacking the information of primary and secondary measures if the data obtained from the same scales. I strongly recommend adding the exact scales in the tables.

Author's response:

Thanks sincerely for your advice.

The “Submitted revision with changes” has been uploaded as the “Supplementary Material”.

The specific scales used in the studies have been added to table 1.

See changes on pages 31, 32, 33.

Editorial office's comments

1. The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s).

Author's response:

Thanks sincerely for your advice.

This research did not receive any grant.

2. The authors did not provide original pictures.

Author's response:

Thanks sincerely for your advice.

The original figures documents have been arranged in one PowerPoint as required.

3. The “Article Highlights” section is missing.

Author's response:

Thanks sincerely for your advice.

The “Submitted revision with changes” has been uploaded as the “Supplementary Material”.

“Article Highlights” has been added at the end of the main text.

See changes on page 19, page 20.

In addition, we have made comprehensive revisions based on the “Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision Meta-Analysis,” including adding additional contents of “Core Tip”, “Article highlights,” and formatting of references.