

Response letter

First of all, we would like to thank the reviewers and Editorial Board members of the journal for critically reading the manuscript and giving valuable advises.

1. LANGUAGE QUALITY

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

Reviewer: There's some minor English language spelling errors need to be corrected, and some form errors in the reference section.

Response: The manuscript was edited (and the language quality thereby improved) by a native speaker of English as demanded (Dr. Paul C. Guest, Great Britain). Dr. Guest has certified this. This language certificate will be submitted together with the revised manuscript.

The error forms in the reference section have been corrected.

5 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

- (1) *Science editor: Self-cited references: There are 14 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations that are closely related to the topic of the manuscript, and remove other improper self-citations.***

Response: We have reduced the number of self-citations accordingly. Now the manuscript contains 11 self-citations (out of 113 papers cited). This is 9.73% (means below 10%).

- (2) *Issues raised: (1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing.***

Response: *This section is included now in the manuscript. Besides, we will send it as a separate document.*

- (3)** *The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;*

Response: This assumption is correct with regard to figure 2, but not to figure 1, since virtually all histologic microphotographs shown therein (Fig. 1A-1H) were taken from our own immunostained human and rat brain tissue sections and have not been published before (not by us, not by others). To clearly indicate this, we now write "this review", whenever these images are mentioned in the text.

Concerning PowerPoint of Figs. 1A-1H: We have prepared the microphotographs in Powerpoint format as requested.

Concerning Fig 2. : This Fig. is reproduced and modified from a paper of Gross and Turecki, published in the journal "CNS & Neurologic Drug Targets " (Bentham Group). This publishing House "sells" the license for any reproduction through the Copyright Clearance Center (license for this particular figure is ID 1114728-1). To document this process the invoice and the payment confirmation (139.65 Euros) are uploaded

Fig. 2 is also in the PowerPoint format now.

- (4)** *PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references.*

Response: We have done our very best to reveal and include all PMID and DOI numbers. Unfortunately, there are two or three journals, which obviously do not possess such identification numbers.

- (5)** *Please obtain permission for the use of picture(s). If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights.*

Response: Done (see our response above, Comment 3).

Lastly, we have prepared a separate document for the tables (63863 – Tables.docx).