

Dear editors,

We really appreciate your kind consideration of our manuscript titled “Review of clinical application of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)”. We are very grateful to you and the reviewers for your invaluable comments and feedback. These comments and criticisms have greatly helped us improve our manuscript and provided crucial guidance for our future research.

According to the Reviewers and Editors’ recommendations, we have supplemented the information regarding each comment and we have added corresponding answers below to each comment. And we also marked the revised portion in red and highlighted them in yellow in the manuscript. The following is a detailed response to the comment from the reviewer and editor. If any question arises, please let us know.

Comments from reviewer:

This is a review about the development of rTMS in the treatment of PTSD. Generally speaking, this article uses refined language to summarize the history and the detail of clinical application of rTMS, and also discuss the future directions of rTMS in PTSD. Because of full explanation of parameters of rTMS in this article, this article has certain guiding significance for clinicians who want to apply it in the clinical work. After carefully reading of this article, here are my detailed comments: 1. In the part of “Principle of rTMS for PTSD”, references are not enough to support the main idea of this topic. I think some references and reviews should be added to better demonstrate the role of long-term potentiation (LTP) in the process of rTMS treating PTSD. 2. There are still some minor linguistic mistakes in the manuscript, such as misuse of singular and plural numbers, and inconsistent tenses.

Answers: Thanks for your precious comments. We have added more references and support material to our paper to elaborate the function and mechanism of LTP in rTMS treating PTSD. Added part has been highlighted in yellow in manuscript. As for linguistic mistakes, we also checked the whole paper to ensure that there is no obvious syntax error.

Comments from editor:

(1) The language classification is Grade C.

Answer: Thanks for your comment. We have checked the whole paper to ensure that there is no obvious syntax error.

(2) The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions;

Answer: Necessary author contribution has been added in the author system.

(3) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s);

Answer: We have added the approved policy of our program to author system.

(4) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Answer: We added the editable figure in author system.

(5) 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;

Answer: Based on the auto analyzer and manual searching, references have been added the detail of PMID and DOI.

(6) Please obtain permission for the use of picture(s).

Answer: The figure used in our manuscript is made by some of our authors. And Approvements have been granted from them. We have added the approvement in our paper file.

(7) The column should be minirevies.

Answer: We are not sure that you ask us to adjust the line spacing. But we have adjusted the line spacing to the minimum.

Sincerely,
Weihui Li