July 15, 2021

Dear Editor,
Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised version of the manuscript **"Affect regulation in psychoanalytic treatments of patients with a borderline personality disorder – Psychoanalysis and Psychodynamic Psychotherapy – a comparison"**

We appreciate your comments, concerns and suggestions. We have incorporated changes within this version of the manuscript.

A point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments is given in this file and we try to address the issues raised by the reviewer as best as possible. We also attached the version with tracked changes to this file (see page 4-43).

Should you have additional comments and further questions please don't hesitate to contact us. We look forward to hearing from you regarding our submission and once again, we thank you for the time and effort you put in reviewing our paper.

Sincerely,

Dagmar Steinmair,
Guoruey Wong,
Sophie Frantal,
Christine Rohm,
Henriette Löffler-Stastka

Comments from Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (High priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: Due to the nature of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy, there are so many variables that it is very difficult to conduct clinical research. Nevertheless, I think it is very encouraging to conduct such a study. I think that the research design was meticulously carried out, and the description of the thesis was appropriate. A few minor points were attached to the paper by leaving notes.

Comment 1 Table 2 came out first. Isn't it usually correct to number tables in the order they appear?

- ⇨ Response 1 Thank you for your comment. We put the findings in the results section and corrected the numbering of the tables accordingly.

Comment 2 It would be better to unravel the first abbreviation.

⇨ Response 2 Thank you for your comment. We explained the abbreviation.

Comment 3 Since classical is a orthodox psychoanalytic term, why not delete it? The explanation of psychoanalysis introduced by the author is considered to be a modern(contemporary) psychoanalytic theory

⇨ Response 3 Thank you, we followed your suggestion.

Comment 4 References should be numbered.

⇨ Response 4: Thank you, we adapted it.

Comment 5 What is the diagnosis of axis 1 by any chance? Borderline personality disorder often has comorbidities, such as depression.

⇨ Response 5: You are right about the comorbidities. We added the diagnosis of axis 1.

Comment 6 The parentheses are wrong.

⇨ Response 6: Thank you.

Comment 7: Is this correct?

⇨ Response 7: We corrected the numbering of the tables, thank you for the comment.

(1) ***Science editor:*** 1. Scientific quality: This retrospective study compared repetitive interaction patterns in patients with BPD undergoing either psychoanalysis or psychodynamic therapy. The topic is within the scope of WJP. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The reviewer only mentioned a few minor points attached to the paper by leaving notes. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: 5 tables and 4 figures; (4) References: A total of 58 references are cited, including 4 references published in the last 3 years, the authors should consider to include more newly published references; (5) Self-cited references: 5 self-cited reference; (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially those published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. 3 Academic norms and rules: The conflict-of-interest disclosure form and the signed copyright license agreement have not been uploaded. Please upload the two files when submitting the revised manuscript. No academic misconduct was found by the Google search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJP. 5 Issues raised: Like the reviewer said, this retrospective study is informative and in high

quality. The academic editor has one more suggestion: please provide the justification of sample size calculation in the method section, if it applies. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Minor revision.

⇨ Response: Thank you for your comments and suggestions. We answered the questions raised by the reviewer. We included more references published in the last 3 years. We uploaded the conflict-of-interest disclosure form and signed the copyright license agreement. The justification of sample size (see participant section 2.2.).

(2) ***Company editor-in-chief:*** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Psychiatry, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

⇨ Response: Thank you again for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised version of the manuscript