

Response to reviewers

Dear reviewers:

Thank you for your careful review and valuable comments concerning the manuscript (Manuscript NO.: 75629).

I am very grateful to your valuable comments for the manuscript. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at huhu@126.com. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Hua Hu

June, 24th, 2022

Response to reviewer #1:

1. The authors observed positive effects of an antidepressant pharmacological treatment combined with a psychodrama-based psychotherapeutic protocol on coping style and functional connectivity between the right superior parietal gyrus and the left inferior frontal gyrus in individuals who suffered childhood trauma and have a diagnosis of major depressive disorder. It is a relevant study from the point of view that new treatment strategies for depression are necessary and urgent, especially in cases of severe depression that are refractory to available treatments. Childhood stress is a significant villain as a predisposing factor to triggering depression and is related to negative coping behavior. I think the research and manuscript are well-founded and suitable for publication.

Response:

Thank you for acknowledging the work of our team.

2. However, in my view, the authors could change the title to make the effect of combination therapy clear. A suggestion: Combined treatment with antidepressants and psychodrama may improve the coping style in depression from childhood trauma. It is just a suggestion, not a demand.

Response:

Thank your comments. We followed your constructive suggestion.

3. Regarding the language, although the authors have provided a manuscript review, some punctuation errors and biases in writing should be reviewed and corrected. So, my perception is that the authors should provide a new review.

Response:

Thank your comments. We did a new manuscript review again, modified parts are marked in *red* font.

Response to reviewer #2:

1. I congratulate the researchers for their efforts. They have done a good job. It is considered an important contribution to the literature.

Response:

Thank you for acknowledging the work of our team.

2. However, it can be useful to consider a few points: GENERAL REVIEW Now, I'm a bit confused concerning the structure and flow of the article. I think this article does not have a clear direction and could perhaps be re-structured. Although, there are the main elements of the scientific article, but it's not very reader-friendly. Improving the overall structure of the main text may help the readers in this respect.

Response:

Thank your comments. The modified parts are marked in *red* font.

3. Besides, English grammar and expression fall short of the standard expected in a quality international journal such as "World Journal of Psychiatry." Authors need to seek assistance from an expert in this area.

Response:

Thank your comments. The modified parts are marked in *red* font.

4. TITLE I'm not sure about the term "patients with childhood traumatic depression." I suggest the authors replace this term with "patients with childhood trauma and major depressive disorder."

Response:

Thank your comments. The modified parts are marked in *red* font.

5. ABSTRACT The abstract of the article in its current form is not very satisfactory. The method section needs to be more informative about type of study, setting, number of patients in each group, and patient assessment tools.

Response:

Thank your comments. The modified parts are marked in *red* font.

6. Moreover, conclusion section should be briefly described the implications of the study, followed by recommendations for future studies.

Response:

Thank your comments. We followed your constructive suggestion. Modified parts are marked in *red* font.

7. INTRODUCTION Your background section is extremely abrupt. It introduces the field, briefly touches upon the prior literature in the field and then just ends. In particular, it is crucial to justify better the aim of the study and, therefore, the hypotheses.

Response:

Thank your comments. We followed your constructive suggestion. Modified parts are marked in *red* font.

8. In addition, the authors need to provide a brief description of childhood trauma.

Response:

Thank your comments. We followed your constructive suggestion. Modified parts are marked in *red* font.

9. METHOD This section needs to be more informative about study design, study time, study setting, as well as sampling method. Besides, it is necessary to explain how the study size was arrived at.

Response:

Thank your comments. We followed your constructive suggestion. Modified parts are marked in *red* font.

10. Please replace “Social-Demographic Questionnaire” with “Sociodemographic Information Form.”

Response:

Thank your comments. We followed your constructive suggestion. Modified parts are marked in *red* font.