

Dear Editor,

We were pleased to have the opportunity to revise our manuscript titled “E-technology support programs for autistic children: Do they work?” (64979). In the revised manuscript, we have considered the reviewers’ comments and suggestions. As instructed, we have attempted to explain the changes made in reaction to the comments. The responses to the suggestions raised are below and colour coded as follows: a) Comments from editors or reviewers are shown as **text**; b) Our responses are shown as **text**.

The reviewers’ comments were helpful overall, and we are appreciative of the constructive feedback on our original submission. After this revision, we feel the quality is much improved.

Sincerely,

Natalie Wall

Reviewer 1:

Natalie G Wall et al. reviewed the development and application of programs and apps hosted on iPads or mobile phones in helping ASD patients and researchers. I think the manuscript is in high-quality.

A: Thank you for reviewing our paper.

1. The E-technology support programs reviewed in the manuscript should be separated into two kinds: intervention technique for ASD patients ('DEFINING CHARACTERISTICS OF AUTISM' part and 'BUILDING SOCIAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS' part), and technique for Researchers ('EYE-TRACKING AND EXPRESSION RECOGNITION' part and 'EVENT RELATED POTENTIALS AND EXPRESSION RECOGNITION' part). So this meaning should be more clearly displayed in the manuscript: the Eye-tracking technique and electroencephalography could help design, evaluate, and screen suitable programs to help ASD children build skills in understanding facial expressions.

A: We agree with your assessment that the manuscript should have more clearly defined sections to help it read more clearly. We have incorporated new headings and sub-headings throughout the paper.

2. In addition, some reference number is wrong. For example, 'a review by Hong, Gong, Ninci, Morin, Davis, Kawaminami, Shi, Noro [27] found that', this reference is 28. 'Lee, Lam, Tsang, Yuen, Ng [36]' should be 37. Please check all the references and correct them.

A: Thank you for pointing out that there was an error with our referencing. This has now been amended and all citations correspond with the reference list.

Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a minireview of the E-technology support programs for autistic children. The topic is within the scope of the WJP. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors reviewed the development and application of programs and apps hosted on iPads or mobile phones in helping ASD patients and researchers. The manuscript is in high-quality. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are no tables and no figures; (4) References: A total of 60 references are cited, including 12 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references 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: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The study was supported by Hunter Medical Research Institute, Australian Government Research Training Program Fee Offset and Scholarship The topic has not previously been published in the WJP.

1. The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions.

A: We have now added the "Author Contributions" section on the first page.

2. Please add table/figure to this review.

A: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added two figures to the paper. One in the eye-tracking section and one in the event related potential section.

Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the 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.

1. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript. There are no restrictions on the figures (color, B/W).

A: Please see point 2 above, under the Science Editor comments.