

Dear Reviewer:

Thank you for the reviewer's comments concerning our manuscript entitled "*Impaired implicit emotion regulation in patients with panic disorder: An ERP study on affect labeling*" (Manuscript NO.: 88586). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to us researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

Comments:

1. This is an excellent paper on an underdeveloped subject such as the regulation process of affect labelling in panic disorder patients. The methodology is adequate and the sample size is enough. The results are promising and opens a new view on the pathology of this disorder. The discussion is interesting and the authors acknowledge the limitations. In fact, a follow-up of the patients would be advisable in new research studies, and also assess whether after successful treatment of these patients, the dysregulation disappears. Overall, the paper is excellent.

Response: Thank reviewer's kind words and valuable feedback! We agree with your recommendation regarding a follow-up of the patients in future research studies. In our revised manuscript, we have incorporated a plan for longitudinal assessments to track changes over time. Additionally, we have emphasized the importance of assessing whether successful treatment leads to the disappearance of observed dysregulation.

We have revised the statement in the Discussion section's final limitation as follows: "Lastly, the study design lacked longitudinal treatment evaluations.

Future studies should consider incorporating follow-up assessments of the patients to track changes over time. This would not only enhance our understanding of the causal relationship between affect labeling and neural activity changes in PD but also allow for an evaluation of whether successful treatment leads to the disappearance of the observed dysregulation".

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper.

We appreciate for Reviewer' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Yours sincerely,

Bing-Wei Zhang

Journal Editorial Board Review

Comments: The authors need to mention the study design and sampling technique used.

Also mention the time period of study.

Response: We have incorporated information on the study design, sampling technique, and the time period of the study in the revised manuscript.

Comments: DSM 5 Axis I disorder. What do you mean by that? DSM 5 don't use axis system.

Response: Dear Editor,

We extend our sincere apologies for the oversight in our submission. Contrary to our initial statement, we employed the DSM-IV diagnostic criteria instead of DSM-5, as our research was conducted at an earlier date. The manuscript has been revised accordingly. We value and thank you for your thorough and patient review.

Comments: How the sample size was determined?

Response: The sample size was determined based on previously published ERP studies related to PD^[9]. We have revised the manuscript.

Comments: What do you mean by this?

Response: Dear Editor,

We extend our sincere apologies for the oversight in our submission. Contrary to our initial statement, we employed the DSM-IV diagnostic criteria instead of DSM-5, as our research was conducted at an earlier date. The manuscript has been revised accordingly. We value and thank you for your thorough and patient review.