Authors' Response to the Editors' and Reviewers' Comments

We would like to thank sincerely for your valuable suggestions and comments. Necessary corrections are incorporated according to your advice. In the following, we will first list each original comment/suggestion (in *italic* font), and then provide our specific responses (in regular font). The possible changes are included in red color font in the manuscript.

Reviewer #1:
Comment:

This is a most meaningful review to summarize the main findings after electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) of depression on the level of different neuroimaging modalities. Those include magnetic resonance imaging, magnetic resonance spectroscopy, SPECT, PET, diffusion tensor imaging (DTI). The paper may benefit from some minor revisions. One would be to analyse combined results, which report the effetcts of ECT on multimodal level. The other would be to insert a table summarizing the findings. Perhaps authors may find it intersting to consider some new advanced studies in the field, e.g.: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811921001725

Response:

Thank you for your valuable suggestion. In terms of language quality, we found every sentence carefully and made through revisions on our manuscript accordingly. Moreover, we insert a table summarizing the findings. We also found some new advanced studies which were incorporated in this manuscript.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

(1) Science editor:

1. Scientific quality: The manuscript describes the neuroimaging research on treatment of major depression with electroconvulsive therapy. The topic is within the scope of the World Journal of Psychiatry (WJP). (1) Classification: Grade B. (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: 1) To analyise combined results, which report the effetcts of ECT on multimodal level; 2) Insert a table summarizing the findings. (3) Format: There is no figure and table. (4) References: A total of 78 references are cited, including 24 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference. 2. Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. The language editing certificate is different with the manuscript's title and authors. 3. Academic norms and rules: The Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form, the signed Informed Consent Form, the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the Institutional Review Board Approval Form are not provided. No academic misconduct was found by the

Google/Bing search. 4. Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The study was The study was supported by Natural Science Foundation of China. The topic has not previously been published in the WJP. 5. Re-Review: Not required. 6. Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) 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. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript.

Response:

According to your suggestions, we carefully corrected the language errors and added the language editing certificate. A table summarizing the findings was also added in our revised manuscript. Our research complied with academic rules and norms. We deeply appreciate your consideration of our manuscript. If you have any queries, please don't hesitate to contact me.