

Response letter

Dear editors and reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled **"Relationship between nightmare distress and depressive symptoms in Chinese emergency department nurses: A cross-sectional study (Manuscript ID: 87212)"**. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, and they will help guide readers toward the importance of this research. We have studied the comments carefully and have made corrections that we hope will be met with approval. The revisions are marked in yellow on the manuscript. The main corrections in the manuscript and the responses to the reviewers' comments are listed as follows:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Comment 1. Relationship between nightmare distress and depressive symptoms in Chinese emergency department nurses: a cross-sectional study. The authors carried out a descriptive study in which they attempted to find a relationship between the presence of nightmares and depressive traits in a large sample of nurses living in several provinces in China. They found a clear correlation between the variables. As higher depressive traits, as greater the number of nightmares. Although the manuscript requires additional revision in terms of language and syntax, it contains a well-done and designed study. The results are of value and interest for the magazine. But it still requires more work before being acceptable for publication.

Response: We are very grateful for your professional and constructive review comments to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have completely revised the manuscript based on your comments and have submitted the revised manuscript to a professional English language editing company to polish the language in the manuscript. We hope that the revised manuscript meets with your approval.

Comment 2. Introduction. The authors cite in references 7 and 2 (lines 80-82 “...together with irregular scheduling and long-term high-stress work, all increased the incidence of nightmare distress among emergency department nurses [7], which also increased the risk of depressive symptoms among emergency department nurses to some extent [2]...). In these lines it is clear that this is an already proven hypothesis. It is advisable that authors clearly indicate what the contribution of present study could be. Furthermore, nowhere in the study is mentioned, beyond a nice purpose, to establish work programs to avoid the confluence of depression and nightmares among nursing staff. Therefore, this part of the text can be eliminated without detriment to the work carried out.

Response: Thank you very much for your careful review of our manuscript and for your constructive suggestions, which we have modified in part according to your comments. (lines 95-104; Introduction)

Comment 3. Methods. Lines 98 and 100: the title of exclusion criteria is repeated.

Response: Thank you for your suggestions, we have made changes based on your comments. (lines 113-114; 2.1 Participants and research design)

Comment 4. In the data analysis section (lines 140-158) the use of several statistical tests (t test, ANOVA) is mentioned, which are not mentioned in the results, or at least are not clearly and properly expressed.

Response: Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions. We have explained the statistical tests (t test, ANOVA) in the results section according to your comments. (lines 184-188; 3.1 Descriptive statistics and correlations)

Comment 5. Results Table 1 indicates “t/F” Which test was used? If it is F (ANOVA), the necessary mention of the degrees of freedom is omitted.

Response: We thank you very much for raising your concern. In Table 1, "t" is for independent sample t tests and "F" is for one-way ANOVAs. In addition, we have added the degrees of freedom for one-way ANOVAs in the table as per your comments. (Table 1)

Comment 6. On the other hand, the values are non-parametric. The appropriate nonparametric test should be used.

Response: We are very grateful for your valuable input that has improved the quality of our manuscript. However, we would like to explain our study in further detail. We analyzed Likert scale data (with a default approximately normal distribution), and the sample size of this study was greater than 200, so we considered the data to be approximately normally distributed and used independent samples t tests and one-way ANOVAs in the analysis (as in the following manuscript; DOI: 10.5498/wjp.v13.i9.675).

Comment 7. The meaning of Table 2 and its contribution to the study is not clear. Consider for the discussion (lines 185-188) that both nightmare and depression scores fell into the moderate range. This aspect is not discussed and is one of the objectives of the study.

Response: We appreciate your constructive comments, which are helpful in improving the quality of our manuscript. We have removed this section based on your overall comments and in light of the purpose of this study.

Comment 8. The correlation results are impressive for the r values. It would be convenient to include graphs and regression lines showing the results.

Response: We are very grateful for your professional comments. We have supplemented the relevant tables based on your comments to make the regression analysis results more clear and concise. (Table 2- Table 4)

Comment 9. Discussion. The results are not really interpreted or discussed. What is the meaning of the results? Many of the discussion paragraphs contain data outside the relevance of the study carried out and in many cases are highly speculative and out of context. For example, when the authors mention some of the neurobiological basis, they only mention the hippocampus, amygdala and cingulum connections. In this case, they should also write about other aspects as well, such as adrenaline and cortisol levels, for which there are abundant studies regarding chronic stress.

Response: We are very grateful for the instructive and professional comments you have provided, which have been very helpful in improving the quality of our manuscript. We have completely revised the Discussion section according to your comments and added studies related to adrenaline and cortisol levels and chronic stress.

Comment 10. The fact that nightmare and depression scores were moderate in this study is not discussed and explain its relevance and impact on the results meaning. As mentioned in the comment about the introduction, the study carried out has nothing to do with any program that avoids or resolves these prolonged stress situations and their consequences. Those paragraphs can be omitted. A direct and brief style is recommended.

Response: We are very grateful for your valuable comments. We have removed this section in response to your comments and have revised the Discussion section using brief language.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade D (Rejection)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific comments to authors

Manuscript ID: 87212 Title: Relationship between nightmare distress and depressive symptoms in Chinese emergency department nurses: a cross-sectional study. The manuscript describes a study on current status of nightmare distress in Chinese emergency department nurses and to explore the relationship between nightmare distress and depressive symptoms. The subject matter of this work is suitable to World Journal of Psychiatry, and the results gathered seem informative. However, major revision is necessary prior to further consideration about its publication. There are numerous grammatical and structural errors. Attached, I am sending a manuscript copy with suggestions for revision.

Response: Thank you very much for your careful review of this manuscript during your busy schedule. We have revised the grammar and structure of the manuscript according to your comments, and the whole text has been edited by a professional to improve the language of the manuscript. We hope that our modifications meet with your approval. Thank you again for your valuable comments on our manuscript.

Editorial Office's Comments:

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it is ready for the first decision.

(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. The quality of the English language of the manuscript does not meet the requirements of the journal. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. When revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response: Thank you very much for helping improve the quality of our manuscript. According to your suggestion, we have submitted the revised manuscript to a professional English language editing company to polish the language in the manuscript, and we have provided the language editing certificate. We have provided the standard

three-line form in the revised manuscript as per your request. In addition, we have added the highlights of the article according to your requirements. We hope that the revised manuscript meets with your approval.

On behalf of all of the authors, I would like to express once again my sincere gratitude to all the editors and reviewers for their hard work in improving the quality of my manuscript. I look forward to hearing from you!

Best regards

Sincerely your

Lilan Zheng

Corresponding author

E-mail: 2737424497@qq.com