

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This study investigated the therapeutic effectiveness of rTMS combined with OLZ and AMI for treatment-refractory schizophrenia (TRS) and its influence on cognitive function. The manuscript is well designed and written. The introduction gives a good overview about the topic and the procedures are precisely described. However, some issues have to be addressed: 1. Please revise the abstract, which needs to be revised to a structured summary. 2. In page 2, The general data of two groups of patients need to be put in the Results, which is not the material and method of the study. 3. Please add whether the study was approved by the Ethics Committee? 4. Please add the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the subjects included in the study. 5. This study is a single-center retrospective study, and more studies may be needed to verify the efficacy of repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Combined with Olanzapine and Amisulpride in the treatment of TRS. Please add the limitations of this study and subsequent work.

Reply: Thank you for your guidance and specific comments. We will continue to maintain the quality of manuscript design and writing, as well as the conciseness of the introduction and the accurate description of the process. The Abstract section has been carefully reviewed and carefully modified as required to become structured. For the Results section, the general information of both groups of patients has been explained in the *General information* and attached Table 1, which contains information on gender, age, course of disease, family history, marital status, and education level of the two groups. We have added in the Methods section that the study has been approved by the ethics committee. We have also described the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants included in this study in the *Patient Information* of the Methods section, and made modifications to make the content clearer and easier to read. As for "This study is a single-center retrospective study, and more studies may be needed to verify the efficacy of repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Combined with Olanzapine and Amisulpride in the treatment of TRS" you mentioned, we have added it in the Discussion section as the limitation of this study that would be addressed in subsequent work.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: "Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Combined with Olanzapine and Amisulpride for Treatment-Refractory Schizophrenia: Analysis of Therapeutic Effectiveness and Its Influence on Cognitive Function" is an interesting paper. Study is well designed and sample size is wide. The text is strictly logical. The results are interesting and they found rTMS plus OLZ + AMI is effective and safe in the treatment of TRS, which can validly improve patients' mental symptoms, CF, and quality of life. The manuscript provided a theoretical basis for clinical treatments and could be useful for other studies in this field. I have really appreciated the discussion section. However,

authors should clearly underline the limitations and drawbacks of the manuscript. Otherwise, this is a very good paper and CAN BE CONSIDERED FOR PUBLICATION.

Reply: Thank you for your guidance and specific comments. We are pleased to have your recognition of the usefulness of this research paper. We will continue to maintain the good design of the study and the rigorous logic of the text in the future. We are also pleased with your recognition of the results of this study that "rTMS plus OLZ + AMI is effective and safe in the treatment of TRS, which can validly improve patients' mental symptoms, CF, and quality of life", as well as your comments that "The manuscript provided a theoretical basis for clinical treatments and could be useful for other studies in this field". We acknowledge your comments on the discussion section and have supplemented it with the limitations and shortcomings of this manuscript to make this paper as smoothly published as possible.