

Reviewer #1: We appreciate the reviewer's suggestions since we think they have contributed to the improvement of the draft. Regarding the specific comments:

1. All suggestions in relation to grammatical and syntax issues have been changed, and language in the whole manuscript has been further revised.
2. With regard to the typing mistakes, most of those errors appear to have been made in the editing process, in the original draft they are ok (except for "adults" and "life stage", both of which have been corrected).
3. A description of the literature search method has been included in the newly created "Literature search methods" section.
4. All the abbreviations have been checked. We became aware that the abbreviation "BDNF" appeared twice and have corrected the error. Besides, the abbreviations for cytosine and thymine were included.
5. The keywords were introduced in the submission process and we have checked that they are correctly shown in the corresponding section. Nonetheless, as it seems that they have not been included in the draft sent to the reviewers, we quote them below:

"Genetics; Adult attachment; Oxytocin; Dopamine; Serotonin; Brain-derived neurotrophic factor; Methylation".

Reviewer #2: We appreciate the reviewer's suggestions since we think they have contributed to the improvement of the draft. Regarding the specific comments:

1. A description of the literature search method has been included in the newly created section "Literature search methods".
2. All the genes studied and reported in relation to adult attachment, in the scientific literature, have been included in the review. We have decided to elaborate a table with the list of the genes from the candidate gene studies along with their corresponding results, in order to address this concern. We hope it will help to provide a general overview that helps to clarify the relationship between genes and adult attachment.
3. We have tried to change the last section ("Discussion and conclusions" instead of "Summary and conclusions") and discussed deeper, albeit briefly, the relationship of genetics with adult attachment. A limitation to address this concern is the lack of solid evidence in the field, as well as the suggestion made by another reviewer about reducing the word count. During the submission process the last section was compulsorily renamed "Conclusions".

Reviewer #3: We really appreciate the reviewer considering the manuscript wonderful, as well as his/her suggestions to improve it. Regarding the specific comments:

Major concerns:

1. We have tried to reduce the word count throughout the entire manuscript, nonetheless, it has been difficult to achieve an overall reduction since we have been requested to expand other parts of the text.

2. Based on the reviewers' and editors' request to include a table, we have elaborated a table with a summary of all candidate gene studies included in the review.

Minor concerns:

1. The study conducted by our group was already mentioned in the "Candidate gene studies" section (see the next point). We thought it was important to mention it, at least superficially, in the "Adult attachment and personality" section as well, since it happens to be one of the few available studies reporting common genetic effects on personality and attachment with a candidate gene approach.

2. When we mention our study in the "Candidate gene studies" we describe it deeper: "Individual heterozygous for COMT Val158Met were found to exert a more avoidant attachment pattern than homozygotes for either allele in the general population [16]. The pattern observed, in which heterozygotes scored higher than either homozygote, is called molecular heterosis. One of the explanations proposed for this fact is that on the cellular level, heterozygosity confers a broader range of genetic expressions and provides greater plasticity [56]."

Science editor: the editor summarizes the comments of the reviewers and the raises the following issues:

1. Author contributions were already included at the end of the text, between the "Acknowledgements" and "References" sections. They might have been removed from the draft sent to the reviewers and the editors to ensure the blind review.

We have changed the full names to initials, and included a new collaborator, dedicated exclusively to research, that has assisted us in the revision process (addressing the reviewers' comments and preparing the table). Most of the original authors are clinicians and currently focused on facing the fourth wave of the pandemic, which is being especially devastating in our region; it was difficult for us to comply with the two weeks deadline proposed for the revision without her help. Thus, and if the editor has no problem in this regard, we have included her as a coauthor and changed the "Author contributions" section to the following:

Author contributions: LE, MZ, AA, MIZ, AA, OO, TMC, ES, JG, EM, NV and NB contributed to the literature search and article review. LE, MZ, AA and NB wrote the draft. AGP contributed to the revision. All authors revised and approved the final manuscript.

Company editor-in-chief: the editor points out that the manuscript fulfills the requirements of the journal and is thus conditionally accepted. He/She raises the following issue: "Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript". We have added a table including all candidate gene studies to comply with his/her request.