

Reply to the Reviewer/Editor.

Dear Respected Editor/Reviewer

Good day

Thank you very much for the comprehensive review and the precious time you spent reviewing this study. We did the advised changes and answered the queries. All the changes were marked in red for easy tracking by the reviewer. The manuscript looks much better with these changes, and we tried to improve the language as we could. Thank you again for your precious assistance.

Here we are replying point by point:

Reviewer 1:

Dear Authors, I am pleased to see that the authors did excellent work clarifying most of the comments I raised in the previous round of the review session. Currently, this paper is a well-written, timely piece of research and reviews the different applications of play therapy in helping children with autism disorder. That said, I just suggest some minor points below, I believe, for the betterment of this manuscript to finalize my review session.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your positive input.

Comment:

1. Introduction: The authors present a narrow view focusing on the main theme of this manuscript, play therapy. However, I recommend that the authors take a broader view, especially on autism, describing more, but concise information in general, including risk factors, pathogenesis, signs and symptoms, current treatment, and challenge, leading to the rationale and purpose of this review article.
(<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-022-02513-5>;
<https://doi.org/10.3390/cells11162607>;
<https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines10030627>;
<https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines10010076>)

Our reply: Thank you very much for your positive input. We added one section at the end of the introduction describing the autism definition, main clinical features, and pathogenesis. We added 5 references. The same also was done previously in the discussion section. However, as the manuscript is mainly about play therapy in

autism, we did not go into details that were prescribed in more detail in our previous articles. We added also one more figure describing the flow chart of the study.

2. Overall, the manuscript contains two figures, two tables, and 152 references.

Our reply: References are currently 157, figures became 3, and tables are the same.

3. This is timely and needed work, thus I believe that the manuscript now meets the Journal's standards for publication. I am always available for other reviews of such interesting and important articles. I look forward to seeing further study on this issue by these authors in the future. I declare no conflict of interest regarding this manuscript. Best regards, Reviewer

Our reply: Thank you very much for your positive input.