

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Reviewer # 2 required that I “explain strongly and briefly about why the issue is important.” At the end of the first paragraph, I have added the statement “In this letter, I summarize the findings of the studies that Erkoreka et al. [1] failed to report and that show why genetic research on attachment should target the endogenous opioid system.” In fact, the relevance of the studies reported in my letter is self-evident. A review of genetics of adult attachment cannot ignore all the data relating to the opioid system which was a major target of research since the years (40 years ago!) when neurobiology merged with psychology to explain the dynamics of affective relationships.

The only abbreviation in the text (i.e.: *OPRM1*) is now preceded by full words explaining its meaning (i.e.: the mu-opioid receptor gene).

Reviewer # 1’s comments consist in quoting verbatim the core tip of the letter followed by the words “this is a good paper”. So, nothing to change.

Language quality has been thoroughly inspected and some minor changes were made. However, the necessity of “a great deal of language polishing” is difficult to understand. For example, there is no place in the text where the word “early” can be correctly preceded by the article. A British colleague of mine defined the writing “impeccable”.

Based on the reviewer's comment (**Reviewer's code:** 05665395), any further revision is practically impossible. **My submission is a Letter to the Editor to amend a major omission in the review paper that WJP published in 2021 (World J Psychiatry. 2021;11(9):530-542. Published 2021 Sep 19. DOI:10.5498/wjp.v11.i9.530).** In fact, the published review omitted to report available evidence linking genetics of opioid transmission and adult attachment. This is an important message to convey to your readers. So, what does it mean that "it lacks depth"? What data are missing to justify reviewer's comment of "incomplete exposition"? Surprisingly enough, the reviewer combines the former criticism with another of "insufficient language conciseness"? The reviewer's comments are so unclear and vague to hinder any further revision. In addition, the original submission dates back to January and I do not want to prolong the interim status of my submission.

In conclusion, it is up to you to publish the Letter in its present form or to reject it.

Best regards,

Professor Alfonso Troisi, M.D.