

Dear editor, Dear reviewers,

Many thanks for processing and commenting on our manuscript NO.: 61175, entitled " Expert consensus of Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP) on the ion channel drugs for neuropathic pain", and for providing us with the chance of revising it and responding to yours and the reviewer's comments. We thank the reviewers for the time and effort that they have put into reviewing the previous version of the manuscript. Their suggestions have enabled us to improve our work.

We made an effort to address all the issues raised by the reviewers and the editorial office in the new version of the manuscript, which I hereby resubmit for your consideration. Please see our responses to each comment in the next pages, with the respective changes made where relevant (also highlighted in the manuscript file in bold blue font). A point-by-point response to reviewers' comments is attached in separate pages.

Hope this version of manuscript meet editor's and reviewer's satisfaction.

Sincerely,

Hong Xiao, MD, Ph.D.

Professor, Department of Algology,

West China Hospital, Sichuan University,

Guo Xue Xiang #37, Wuhou District, Chengdu 610041, Sichuan Province, China.

The point by point responses to the reviewers' comments:

Response to the Reviewer #1 comments:

This expert consensus on the ion channel drugs for neuropathic pain is very interesting. In this consensus, the mechanism and characteristics of sodium and calcium channel drugs were reviewed. The authors developed the recommendations for the therapeutic principles and clinical practice for Carbamazepine, Oxcarbazepine, Lidocaine, Bulleyaconitine A, Pregabalin and Gabapentin. The manuscript is very well written, and the reviewer thinks it will provide direction for clinicians and patients when they use ion channel drugs for the management of neuropathic pain.

We thank the reviewer for their kind words and interested in this expert consensus.

Minor suggestions:

(1) The manuscript requires a minor editing. Some minor language polishing should be revised.

Thanks for your suggestion, we asked an English native speaker for language editing.

(2) Tables should refered in the main text.

Thanks for your suggestion, we corrected it. Please see in page 6 and 9.

Response to editorial office's comments:

5 Issues raised: (1) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (2) Authors should always cite references that are relevant to their study. Please check and remove any references that not relevant to this study.

We updated and removed the irrelevant the reference, the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers were provided.