Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Sodium selenite may be not the optimal speciation as an effective therapy for arsenic-induced anxiety-/depression-like behavior" (Manuscript NO: 76133). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Rejection

Specific Comments to Authors: It is a letter to the editor, where the authors mainly discuss drawback of the considered study. I have came though the study they are considering as well as their comments and found: 1) authors are making comments to the study that have not been published in this journal (even publishing house is different - springer). Secondly, the argument about models might be partially correct but the original study did not aimed to seek sources of Se and Ar. They just investigated the possible mechanisms. I do agree with authors that the findings of original study needs further confirmations, models must be clearly explained and, correspondingly, a well-designed study(ies) are necessary to clear up their results. 3) some sentences are hard to read (e.g., In addition, there are many mouse models of depression and anxiety, however, classical mouse model of depression was not used in this study - it is not sound scientifically accurate). I suggest authors to consider "opinion" or more detailed description of problem with a clear explanation of each key problems. If authors are willing to submit such a work then I would be willing give a positive comments. Overall, I came to the conclusion that this letter to the editors is not suitable for this journal.

Response: Thank you very much for your reference. I will review the paper you recommend at my leisure.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Thanks for recommending me as a reviewer. Sodium selenite (SS) was selected as selenium supplement to improve the behavior of depression-like mice induced by arsenic in this study. This LETTER TO THE EDITOR is well-written. In the introduction, the theoretical background is well described. The conclusion is suitable for the purpose of the study.

Response: Thank you very much for your valuable advice. We have carefully revised the grammar and sentences of the whole paper.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Please see the attached document to see the reviewer's comments.

Response: Thank you very much for your valuable advice. We have carefully revised the grammar and sentences of the whole paper.

Company editor-in-chief:

您提交题目与约稿注册题目不一致。您应该评论 World Journal of Psychiatry 相关文章。请您补充文献。 I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, 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.

Response: we added two references to my manuscript as follows:

1. Yang XY, Ma ZL, Storm DR, Cao H, Zhang YQ. Selective ablation of type 3

adenylyl cyclase in somatostatin-positive interneurons produces anxiety- and depression-like behaviors in mice. World J Psychiatry. 2021;11(2):35-49.

2. Porter GA, O'Connor JC. Brain-derived neurotrophic factor and inflammation in depression: Pathogenic partners in crime? World J Psychiatry. 2022;12(1):77-97.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes but marked in red in revised paper.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.