

Response to Editor and Reviewers' Comments

World Journal of Psychiatry - Baishideng Publishing Group, Manuscript NO. 78300

Title: "EMOTION RECOGNITION SUPPORT SYSTEM: WHERE PHYSICIANS AND PSYCHIATRISTS MEET LINGUISTS AND DATA ENGINEERS"

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We thank you for your careful review of the paper and the valuable suggestions that have helped improve the depth and presentation of the manuscript. This letter provides answers to the comments we received, based on which the paper has been revised. The suggestions have been incorporated in the revised manuscript.

I. Reviewer 1

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a very carefully written review in a stage after substantial revision. There is proposed in it a conceptual model for emotion recognition of speech set in a multi-disciplinary framework to address needs of psychiatry and other health professions for proper patient emotion recognition in patient-doctor communication. All comments from the peer review report have been addressed on a sufficient level to merit acceptance for publication.

Reply: Thank you for acknowledging our efforts in the revision process, and the importance of the study and its main idea. We would like to also thank you once again for your valuable comments in the previous round of review.

II. Reviewer 2

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Peyman Adibi et al present an exceptional paper regarding the use of an emotion recognition support system to aid physicians with the emotional aspects of patients' feelings during a medical interview and for the management of the patient's illness. Definitely, emotions have been abandoned by many health professionals and much training is needed. Observations: The first part of the paper is very long but necessary to understand the principles of the proposal which is much shorter I would only suggest the authors add a short conclusion to wrap up the review with some perspectives before the appendix section.

Reply: Thank you for your time and efforts in reviewing our manuscript. We are very pleased to know that you have found our manuscript to be of high quality. Regarding the second part of your comment, as per your suggestion we have added a short conclusion to wrap up the main ideas mentioned in the review, before the appendix section, thank you.

III. Editorial Office's Comments

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Reply: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. Regarding the language quality, we had the manuscript proofread and edited by a professional English language editing service, whose certificate is provided along with the manuscript. Moreover, parts of the manuscript was further checked via online services such as Grammarly, to make sure no grammatical issues are left behind.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

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. Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Reply: Thank you very much for personally reviewing the manuscript. We truly appreciate your acknowledgment of our manuscript. Regarding your remark on the Figures, in the revised submission files, we have provided a single PowerPoint file as you suggested. As for the final part of your comment on updating our manuscript concerning the latest research in the relevant field, we have cited the most relevant papers using the RCA database as per your suggestion. For example, references no. 87 to 91 in the revised manuscript have been added based on the search for the top ranked papers in the context of SER, provided by RCA database, thank you.